LB 2806
5
B4
Copy 1

THE REFERENCE SHELF

REPRINTS OF SELECTED ARTICLES
BRIEFS, BIBLIOGRAPHIES, DEBATES
STUDY OUTLINES OF TIMELY TOPICS

Volume 1 Number 5

The Towner-Sterling Bill

(U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION)

LAMAR T. BEMAN, Compiler

JAN 15 1923

THE H.W. WILSON COMPANY
958 University Ave. New York City

monograph

The Reference Shelf

is published to make available when needed good debates, collections of articles, briefs, bibliographies and study outlines, on timely subjects for public discussion. Each number is devoted to a single subject. To make the material available at the time of greatest need, publication is irregular. Each volume will contain at least ten separate issues, about 800 pages in all, and will cover about a year in time.

Subscription price per volume (ten issues, 800 pages in all, costing if ordered separately, $7 or more). $4.50.

Price for single copies, averaging 80 pages each, 75c, may vary for extremely large or small issues. Ten or more copies of one issue, one-third off.

VOLUME I. *Contents*

No. 1. CANCELLATION OF ALLIED DEBT (Debate, briefs, references and reprints) 75c

No. 2. CHINA AND JAPAN (Study outline) 50c

No. 3. ST. LAWRENCE RIVER SHIP CANAL (Briefs, references, reprints) 75c

No. 4. KANSAS COURT OF INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS (Briefs, references, reprints) 75c

No. 5. TOWNER-STERLING BILL (U. S. Dept. of Education) (Briefs, references, reprints) 75c

In Preparation

QUESTIONS OF THE HOUR. New ed. (Study outline)

ENFORCEMENT OF THE DECISIONS OF THE RAILWAY LABOR BOARD (Briefs, references, reprints)

CABINET FORM OF GOVERNMENT (Briefs, references, reprints)

Future issues to be announced

LB2806
.5
.B4

Volume 1 December, 1922 Number 5

The Reference Shelf

Briefs, Bibliographies, Debates, Reprints of Selected Articles and Study Outlines on Timely Topics

Published by THE H. W. WILSON COMPANY

958-964 University Avenue *New York City*

The Towner-Sterling Bill

(FEDERAL DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION)

~~JULIA E. JOHNSEN~~, Compiler Should be Beman. cf. Letter from The H. W. Wilson company filed under Beman

INTRODUCTION

Startling and amazing were the defects and shortcomings in our educational system revealed by the war. The preceding census had reported illiterate 7.7 per cent of the people ten years of age and over, but of the men called for military service and examined as to intelligence 24.9 per cent were classified as illiterate. This difference may be at least partly explained by the fact that the census defines an illiterate as one who has never attended school at all, and perhaps partly by the further fact that the census enumerators ask the persons enumerated the various questions about themselves and the members of their families, and accept their answers without further investigation. In a like manner the war showed that physical ailments and defects were much more general that anyone had supposed. More than one-quarter of the men called for service were rejected for general military service because of physical defects, most of which might have been prevented or remedied by health education or corrective physical training. The war also demonstrated the need for earnest work in Americanization, for many men called for ser-

vice were unable to understand commands given in our language. The shortage of qualified and trained teachers, the inequalities in educational opportunities, the backwardness of many schools in still devoting so large a part of the students' time to subjects of no pratical value, are among the other defects of our schools. A considerable part of our teachers, particularly in the rural districts are only children. Some states, and more particularly some communities have utterly failed to provide adequate educational opportunities for their children, with the result that there are two and a quarter millions of children between seven and fifteen years of age who are not attending school, and about as many more between fifteen and seventeen years of age.

These are the main defects in our educational system, but by no means all of them. In February, 1918, the National Education Association appointed a Commission on the Emergency in Education which considered these defects and drew up a bill designed to remedy them. It was introduced in the Sixty-fifth Congress, and again in the Sixty-sixth Congress, where it was revised and amended, and reported favorably by the committee in each house, but it received very little attention from that Congress. It was again introduced in the Sixty-seventh Congress where it is known as the Towner-Sterling Bill.

To the discussion of the Towner-Sterling Bill this number of The Reference Shelf is devoted. Whether this bill is the proper remedy for the grave shortcomings and defects in our educational system or not may properly be a matter for discussion and a matter of difference of opinion, but it is certainly disheartening and discouraging to read the trash that often fills the pages of the Congressional Record and usually fills the pages of the average newspaper while so little attention is given to a matter so vital to our national welfare as the proper measure to remedy the defects in our educational system.

LAMAR T. BEMAN

December 26, 1922.

BRIEF

RESOLVED: *That the Towner-Sterling bill should be enacted into law.*

AFFIRMATIVE

INTRODUCTION

A. Explanation of the provisions of the bill.
B. The attitude of the Federal Government toward public education in the past.

I. There are serious defects in our present system of public education.

A. Illiteracy is so prevalent as to be a national disgrace and a menace to our free institutions.

1. About five millions of our people ten years of age and over (or 6 per cent of the population) are unable to read or write any language.
2. Three million of these are native-born Americans.
3. About one-quarter of the men examined as to intelligence when called for military service during the late war were found to be illiterate.
4. For each one thousand of population there are sixty illiterates in the United States to one in Germany, to five in Switzerland, to six in the Netherlands, to nine in Finland, to ten in Norway and Sweden.

B. The great number of unassimilated foreigners living in great colonies and perpetuating foreign ideals, and in some cases foreign loyalties, is a constant danger.

1. There are about fourteen million persons of foreign birth residing in the United States, five million of whom cannot read or write the English language.
2. In many of our cities a large part of the population, sometimes one-third of it, is of foreign birth, while the foreign-born together with those of

foreign parentage often make a majority, sometimes more than three-quarters of the population of the city.

C. There is a serious shortage of qualified and efficient teachers.
   1. Since the beginning of the World War thousands of public schools have been closed for a time at least because of the inability to get teachers.
   2. One-fourth part of the teachers in the public schools of this country is made up of people twenty-one years of age or under; one-half, twenty-five or under.
   3. A large part of the teachers in our public schools has not had the education or training properly to qualify them for teaching.
   4. A large part of the teachers takes up teaching as a temporary occupation and continues in it for only a few years.

D. The neglect of health education and physical training in many of our public schools is undermining the vitality of the nation.
   1. One-fourth of the men examined for army service in the late war was found to have some physical defect or ailment which in many cases could have been cured by health education or correcting training.

E. Public education now needs from the Federal Government recognition of its dignity and its importance as a national problem, aid and support in its efforts, integration, coordination, and a voice in national deliberations which can come only from representation in the President's Cabinet.

II. The Towner-Sterling bill will remedy the shortcomings and defects in our system of public education.
   A. It provides the funds and the incentive for the rapid elimination of illiteracy.
   B. It will help and support the states in their Americanization work.
   C. It will greatly assist in providing a sufficient number of well educated and trained teachers.

D. It encourages and supports health education, physical education, and physical training.

E. It creates a Secretary of Education who shall be a member of the President's Cabinet and who shall be the head of the Department of Education in the Federal Government.

III. The Towner-Sterling bill is a practicable measure.

A. Practically every other advanced nation in the world has a national department or ministry of education.

B. The Federal Government has often aided and encouraged public education by land grants, by gifts to the states, by the collection of data and statistics and the publication of studies and reports.

C. The Federal Government has granted recognition to other fields of endeavor where it does not have the constitutional power to exercise control, e.g., Agriculture, Labor, and Commerce.

D. Public education in this country is a national problem.

1. Federal action alone can remedy the evils and shortcomings that now exist in our educational system.
2. Illiteracy is self-perpetuating in a locality.
3. Some states and some communities are very backward in educational matters.

E. The supervision and control of education are left by this bill to the states, as the constitution provides, but the advice and financial aid of the Federal Government are given to the states, and coordination is made possible.

F. The bill has been sponsored by the National Education Association, and has been endorsed and approved by most of our ablest educators

Negative

Introduction

A. Explanation of the bill.

B. This is a radical change in the educational policy of this country.

I. The adoption of the Towner-Sterling bill is unnecessary.
   A. Public education in the United States is constantly improving.
      1. Improvements are constantly being made in buildings, equipment, teachers, methods, and curriculum.
      2. The study of the dead languages is rapidly disappearing, giving place to vocational studies, health education, and other useful and valuable knowledge.
      3. Centralized schools are greatly improving rural education.
      4. By night schools and part time schools an effort is being made to reach adults who need more education.
      5. Our public schools today are very far superior to our private schools.
   B. Illiteracy is constantly and rapidly decreasing.
      1. Between 1900 and 1920 it decreased by about a million and a quarter.
   C. There is no cause for anxiety in the number of foreign-born residents.
      1. Americanization is a new movement, but one that is being adopted quite generally where there is need of it.
      2. The foreign-born citizens were very loyal during the war.
      3. The children of foreign-born parents are almost invariably good citizens.
   D. The shortage of teachers during and just after the war was a temporary situation and was due to the conditions which the war produced.
   E. Each state can best solve its own educational problems unhampered by federal interference.

II. The Towner-Sterling bill is unwise and undesirable.
   A. It involves grave dangers to public education.
      1. It will lead to federal domination of public education.
      2. It will tend to create uniformity, standardization, centralization.
      3. It will inject national politics into our public schools.

B. It is very unwise for the Federal Government, now so heavily in debt and imposing taxes so oppressive to the people and to industry, to undertake any new and unnecessary financial burdens.

C. It is unfair and unjust to the states.

1. It is an unwarranted interference with their constitutional rights.
2. It is meddling with their internal institutions by outsiders who fail to understand their local needs and local conditions.
3. It will compel the people of some states to pay in part for the education of other states.

III. The Towner-Sterling bill is impracticable.

A. It is un-American.

B. It cannot greatly improve conditions.

1. Better qualified teachers can only be obtained when better salaries are paid.
2. The funds named in the Towner-Sterling bill are totally inadequate for the purposes specified.

C. It will over-organize education, creating a bureaucracy at Washington.

D. It is opposed by some of our ablest educators, men like President Nicholas Murray Butler of Columbia University.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bibliographies

Mahoney, Robert H. The federal government and education. p. 76-9. Catholic University of America. 1922.

U.S. Bureau of Education. The proposed federal department of education. 6p. Multigraphed. 1921.

General References

Books and Pamphlets

American Council on Education. Arguments submitted in connection with a referendum on proposed federal legislation providing for the creation of a department of education and federal aid for education. 20p. about 1920.

Education Bill: joint hearings before the committees on education and labor on Senate bill 1017 and House bill 7, July 10-22, 1919. 162p. Government Printing Office. 1919.

Mahoney, Robert H., The federal government and education. Catholic University of America. 80p. 1922.

Periodicals

American Political Science Review. 15: 335-49. Ag. '21. The educational function of the national government. Henry B. Learned.

The Capitol Eye. 1: 3-9. D. '21. The Towner-Sterling bill.

Current Opinion. 70: 76-7. Ja. '21. Federal control urged to meet the crisis in education.

Educational Review. 58: 21-30. Je. '19. Education a national system. Horace A. Eaton.

Educational Review. 62: 127-33. S. '21. The government and education. Samuel P. Capen.

Elementary School Journal. 20: 600-9. Ap. '20. A federal department of education. W. P. Burris.

Elementary School Journal. 20: 610-17. Ap. '20. Desirable amendments of the Smith-Towner bill. Charles H. Judd.

Literary Digest. 69:26. Ap. 16, '21. The fight against federal aid for schools.

Nation. 108:780. My. 17, '19. A Secretary of Education.

New York Times. Sec. 7. p. 1+5. F. 20, '21. Federal education bill arouses controversy.

School and Society. 9:613-18. My. 24, '19. The colleges in a nationalized educational scheme. Samuel P. Capen.

School and Society. 10:591-4. N. 22, '19. Why and how should we federalize education? H. A. Hollister.

School and Society. 11:661-74. Je. 5, '20. The federal department of education. Charles H. Judd.

School and Society. 14:589-600. D. 24, '21. The relation of state and nation in educational policy. David Kinley.

School and Society. 16:133-40. Jl. 29, '22. Documents on the Towner-Sterling bill.

School Life. 1:1+12. O. 16, '18. Introduces bill to create department of education.

School Life. 2:1-2. F. 1, '19. Department of education bill introduced in the House.

School Life. 3:3+8. Ag. 1, '19. Education bill discussed in Senate.

University of Illinois Bulletin. vol. 19, no. 23. Feb. 6, 1922. Proceedings of a conference on the relation of the federal government to education held Dec. 1 and 2, 1921. 110p.

Affirmative References

Books and Pamphlets

Bagley, William C. A federal department of education. National education association: addresses and proceedings of the 58th annual meeting. p. 449-58. 1920.

Bagley, William C. Federal aid for public schools. National education association; addresses and proceedings of the 59th annual meeting. p. 618-23. 1921.

Beveridge, J. H. A national program for education. National education association: addresses and proceedings of the 57th annual meeting. p. 509-14. 1919.

Campbell, P. L. The proposed federal department of education. Transactions and proceedings of the National association of state universities. vol. 16. p. 162-8. 1918.

James, Edmund J. A national program for education. National education association: addresses and proceedings of the 57th annual meeting. p. 517-23. 1919.

Keith, John A. H. and Bagley, William C. The nation and the schools. Macmillan. 1920.

Kendall, C. N. A national program for education. National education association: addresses and proceedings of the 57th annual meeting. p. 514-17. 1919.

MacCracken, John T. The bill for a national department of education. National education association: addresses and proceedings of the 56th annual meeting. p. 191-5. 1918.

Magill, Hugh S. Our legislative program. National education association: addresses and proceedings of the 57th annual meeting. p. 654-8. 1919.

National Education Association. A department of education with a secretary of education in the President's cabinet. Special Bulletin no. 8. 4p. 1920.

National Education Association. Education and the federal government. Hugh S. Magill. 8p. 1921.

National Committee for a Department of Education. Facts about the educational bill. 12p. 1921.

National Committee for a Department of Education. Facts about the education bill. 10p. 1921.

National Education Association. The Smith-Towner bill. Hugh S. Magill. 8p. 1920.

National Education Association. The Smith-Towner bill embodies two fundamental principles differing from other federal-aid bills. Special Bulletin no. 12. 4p. 1921.

National Education Association. The Towner-Sterling bill. An analysis of the provisions of the bill; a discussion of the principles and policies involved; and a presentation of facts and figures relating to the subject. National Education Association. 76p. 1922.

National Education Association. Why a secretary of education? Special Bulletin no. 10. Hugh S. Magill. about 1920.

Public School Association of the City of New York. National leadership in education. A reply to President Butler's criticism of the proprosed federal department of education. 1921.

Strayer, George D. A national program for education. National education association: addresses and proceedings of the 57th annual meeting. p. 523-4. 1919.

Towner, Horace M. National aid for education. National education association; addresses and proceedings of the 59th annual meeting. p. 786-95. 1921.

United States. 66th Congress, 3d session. House Report. no. 1201. Create a department of education. Jan. 17, 1921.

United States. 66th Congress, 3d session. Senate Report. no. 824. Calendar no. 791. Creating a department of education. Feb. 24, 1921.

Periodicals

American City. 24: 115-18. F. '21. A national point of view in education. George D. Strayer.

Atlantic Monthly. 125: 528-38. Ap. '20. Educating the nation. Frank E. Spaulding.

Builder (National Masonic Research Society). 8: 227-55. Ag. '22. Public School Number. Symposium. H.M. Towner et al.

Child Labor Bulletin. 7: 54-74. My. '18. Federal aid for education. Edward N. Clopper.

Congressional Record. 58: 3236-41, +3242. Jl. 28, '19. Department of Education. Hoke Smith.

Congressional Record. 60: 2060-2. Ja. 26, '21. The education bill. Hoke Smith.

Congressional Record. 60: 2102-3. Ja. 27, '21. Department of Education. Hoke Smith.

Congressional Record. 60: 2182-3. Ja. 29, '21. Department of Education. Hoke Smith.

Congressional Record. 60: 2359-61. Ja. 31, '21. Department of Education. Hoke Smith.

Congressional Record. 60: 2890. F. 10, '21. Department of Education. Hoke Smith.

Congressional Record. 60: 3038-44. F. 12, '21. Department of Education. Hoke Smith.

Congressional Record. 61: 1350-2. My. 12, '21. Federal aid to education. Kenneth McKellar.

Educational Review. 60: 271-84. N. '20. Why the Smith-Towner bill should become a law. George D. Strayer.

Educational Review. 60: 296-307. N. '20. The Smith-Towner bill. Hugh S. Magill.

Educational Review. 60: 308-14. N. '20. The national organization of education. Charles R. Mann.

Educational Review. 61:65-70. Ja. '21. A reply to the arguments against the Smith-Towner bill. George D. Strayer.

Educational Review. 63:102-9. F. '22. Federal organization for education. Charles R. Mann.

Educational Review. 63:395-401. My. '22. The need of national organization for educational service. Olive M. Jones.

Educational Review. 64:41-51. Je. '22. Federal aid for education. Paul H. Douglas.

Elementary School Journal. 20:593-9. Ap. '20. Why we need a secretary of education. George D. Strayer.

Elementary School Journal. 21:727-9. Je. '21. The Sterling-Towner bill.

Journal of Education. 89:5-7. Ja. 2, '19. Brief of arguments in favor of S.B. 4987. 65th Congress, 2nd session. John A. H. Keith.

Journal of Education. 91:154. F. 5, '20. Smith-Towner bill.

Journal of the National Education Association. 10:155-8. N. '21. Education and the federal government. Hugh S. Magill.

Nation. 106:256-7. Mr. 7, '18. A national department of education. John H. MacCracken.

New York Times. Sec. 3. p. 1-2. Jl 21, '18. Plan to meet emergency in schools due to the war. George D. Strayer.

New York Times. Sec 3. p. 2. S. 15, '18. New school system. Harris Hancock.

Outlook. 123:123-4. S. 24, '19. If hogs, why not children?

Proceedings of the Academy of Political Science. 9:534-8. Jl. '21. Federal expenditures for public education. Hugh S. Magill.

School and Society. 7:405-6. Ap. 6, '18. A national department of education.

School and Society. 7:472-3. Ap. 20, '18. The federal interest in education. Harvard Alumni Bulletin.

School and Society. 10:167. Ag. 9, '19. Senator Smith on the Smith-Towner bill.

School and Society. 11:674-81. Je. 5, '20. National leadership and national support for education.

School and Society. 14:259-63. O. 8, '21. Education and the federal government. Hugh S. Magill.

School and Society. 14:455. N. 19, '21. The federal department of education.

School and Society. 15: 113-15. Ja. 28, '22. National leadership in education. Public Education Association of New York City.

School and Society. 16: 250. Ag. 26, '22. The national education association president and the Towner-Sterling bill.

School Life. 4: 15-16. Mr. 1, '20. For a secretary of education. William C. Bagley.

School Life. 6: 8. Ja. 15, '21. Federal aid—not federal control.

School Review. 29: 726-8. D. '21. A petition for a federal department of education.

Teaching. 4: 4-7. F. '19. Federal assistance to education in the several states. J. W. Crabtree.

Negative References

Books and Pamphlets

Blakely, Paul L. The case against the Smith-Towner bill. America Press. 40p. 1920.

Butler, Nicholas M. Over-organization in education. Columbia University Bulletin of Information. 22nd series. no. 10. p. 20-3. 1921.

Burris, W. P. A federal department of education. National education association: addresses and proceedings of the 58th annual meeting. p. 444-9. 1920.

Periodicals

America. (National Catholic Weekly, 39 West 86 Street, New York City.) Contains about one hundred articles on the negative by Rev. Paul L. Blakely. S.J., beginning in October, 1918.

American School Board Journal. 58: 24. Mr. '19. State or national control of education. A. S. Martin.

American School Board Journal. 60: 44-5. F. '20. A national department of education. A. S. Martin.

Boston Herald. Jl. 6, '22. Why we oppose federal control of education. (editorial).

Boston Transcript. Jl. 7, '22. Bill to Europeanize our public schools. (editorial).

Boston Transcript. Jl. 8, '22. Millions for aid but not one cent for bribery. (editorial).

Bulletin. Catholic Educational Association. vol. 16. no. 4. The federal government and education. William D. Guthrie. 13p. Ag. 1920.

Catholic Educational Review. 17: 326-36. Je. '19. The Towner bill and the centralizing of educational control. Thomas E. Shields.

Catholic Educational Review. 18: 332-56. Je. '20. For the freedom of education.

Congressional Record. 58: 3241-2. Jl. 28, '19. Department of Education. Charles S. Thomas.

Congressional Record. 59: 7478-80. My. 22, '20. Against federal interference. William H. King.

Congressional Record. 60: 3044-9. F. 12, '21. Department of education. William H. King.

Congressional Record. 60: 3292. F. 17, '21. Letter of protest from faculty and students of Mount St. Michaels, of Hillyard, Wash.

Congressional Record. 60: 3596-7. F. 22, '21. Protest of the Grand Forks Council of the Knights of Columbus.

Congressional Record. 60: 3915. F. 26, '21. Protest of the General Board of L'Union St. Jean-Baptiste d'Amerique.

Congressional Record. 62: 10209-11. Je. 26, '22. The Smith-Towner bill. Caleb R. Layton.

Congressional Record. 62: 11437-41. Jl. 22, '22. Administration by collective authority. William H. King, et al.

Educational Record. 1: 118-31. My. '20. National problems in education. Charles H. Judd.

Educational Review. 60: 285-95. N. '20. Arguments against the Smith-Towner bill. Samuel P. Capen.

Educational Review. 61: 54-65. Ja. '21. Why the Smith-Towner bill should not become a law. Charles R. Mann.

Educational Review. 61: 70-9. Ja. '21. The Smith-Towner bill again. Virgil G. Michel.

Educational Review. 63: 402-11. My. '22. Federalization and state educational bankruptcy. Edward A. Fitzpatrick.

Journal of Education. 87: 453-4. Ap. 25, '18. A warning. C. P. Cary.

New York Times. Sec. 7. p. 10. F. 19, '22. Education department bill.

Pittsburgh School Bulletin. 14: 453-61. Ja '21. Perils in the Smith-Towner bill. Elmer Kenyon.

School and Society. 10: 495-8. O. 25, '19. The Smith-Towner education bill. W. P. Burris.
School Life. 4: 14. Mr. 1, '20. Against a Secretary of Education. William P. Burris.
Springfield Union. Jl. 6, '22. The Smith-Towner bill. (editorial).
Teachers' Journal. 13: 4-5. Ap. '20. The real Smith bill.
Washington Post. Je. 16, '19. Priest attacks bill,—Rev. Mr. McDonnell warns of menace in education act.

REPRINTS

BRIEF HISTORY OF THE BILL [1]

The recent World War emphasized the shortcomings and defects, as well as the excellencies and strengths of the public-school systems of our several states. As never before the people became aware of the prevalence and extent of illiteracy, of non-English-speaking aliens and foreign settlements in our midst, of physical defects which might be remedied, of poorly qualified and inadequately paid teachers, and of glaring inequalities in educational opportunities throughout the country. Each of these defects was seen to have a damaging influence on our successful prosecution of the war. The situation was described in a war-born term as an "emergency," but it existed before the war, and it still exists. It calls for remedy from the standpoint of the individual, the community, the state, and the Nation because these educational defects are as disastrous to the individual, the community, the state, and the Nation in times of peace as they are in times of war.

Realizing its responsibility to the Nation—a responsibility growing out of its intimate acquaintance with these educational defects—the National Education Association in February, 1918, appointed a "Commission on the Emergency in Education." This commission was aware of the fact that the sovereign right and power to organize, supervise, and administer public education in the several states is vested in the states under the provisions of the Federal Constitution. The commission was also aware of the fact that the Federal Government has aided public education in the several states during its entire existence. This policy of federal aid to public education in the states grew out of a clear perception by the founders of our Nation of the necessary relationship between education and democracy. The effective exercise of every sovereign power of our National Government is dependent upon intelligent, right-minded citizenship. An educated citizenry is the first great need of today, just as it was the first great need of the new republic in 1789.

[1] National Education Association. The Towner-Sterling Bill. p. 13-15.

Bill Prepared by National Education Association

The Commission of the National Education Association prepared a measure which was introduced in the Senate in October, 1918, by Senator Hoke Smith, of Georgia, and which was known as the Smith Bill. This original bill followed quite closely the provisions contained in the Smith-Lever and Smith-Hughes Acts. Certain of these provisions were justly criticised as permitting too much federal interference. These objectionable features were eliminated and the bill carefully revised and reintroduced in the Senate at the opening of the special session of the Sixty-sixth Congress in May, 1918, by Senator Hoke Smith. It was introduced in the House by Representative Horace Mann Towner, of Iowa, and was known throughout the Sixty-sixth Congress as the Smith-Towner Bill. It was favorably reported by both the House and Senate Committees on Education near the close of the Sixty-sixth Congress in February, 1921, but did not come to a vote in either house. The bill was again revised, and at the opening of the special session of the Sixty-seventh Congress in April, 1921, was reintroduced in the House by Congressman Towner, and in the Senate by Senator Thomas Sterling, of South Dakota. The bill is known in the present, or Sixty-seventh Congress, as the Towner-Sterling Bill and is now pending in the Committees on Education of the Senate and House.

PROVISIONS OF THE BILL[1]

The purpose of the Sterling-Towner Bill as stated in the preamble is "to create a Department of Education, to authorize appropriations for the conduct of said department, to authorize the appropriation of money to encourage the states in the promotion and support of education, and for other purposes." The principal provisions of the bill are as follows:

1. A Department of Education is created with a Secretary in the President's Cabinet and an Assistant Secretary. (Sec.1, 2).

2. The Bureau of Education is transferred to the Department of Education and Congress is authorized to transfer to it such other offices, bureaus and branches of the government as in its judgment should be administered by the Department of Education. (Sec. 3).

[1] By Robert H. Mahoney. The Federal Government and Education. p. 38-40.

3. It shall be the duty of the Department of Education to conduct studies and investigations in the field of education and report thereon. Research shall be undertaken in (a) illiteracy; (b) immigrant education; (c) public school education, and especially rural education; (d) physical education, including health education, recreation, and sanitation; (e) preparation and supply of competent teachers for the public schools; (f) higher education; and in such other fields as, in the judgment of the Secretary of Education require attention and study. The Secretary of Education is further empowered to make appointments, or recommendations of appointments, of educational attaches to foreign embassies. (Sec. 5).

4. Five hundred thousand dollars, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is appropriated annually for the purpose of paying salaries, conducting investigations, and paying expenses incidental to administration. (Sec. 6).

5. The following sums or as much thereof as may be necessary are appropriated for cooperation with the states:

a. Seven million five hundred thousand dollars is authorized to be appropriated for the instruction of illiterates fourteen years of age and over.

b. Seven million five hundred thousand dollars for the Americanization of immigrants.

c. Fifty million dollars for the partial payment of teachers' salaries, for providing better instruction and extending school terms, especially in rural localities. To avail itself of this provision, the state will maintain the following requirements as nearly as its constitutional provisions will permit:

   (1) A legal school term of at least twenty-four weeks in each year;

   (2) A compulsory school attendance law;

   (3) A law requiring that the English language be the basic language of instruction in the common-school branches in all schools, public and private.

d. Twenty million dollars for the promotion of physical education.

e. Fifteen million dollars for the preparation of teachers for public-school service, particularly in the rural. (Secs. 7-11).

6. To secure the benefits of any one or more of the respective apportionments authorized in sections 7-11 inclusive of this act, a state shall by legislative enactment accept the provisions

of the act, and designate the state's chief educational authority to represent said state in the administration of the act. Moreover, the state must appropriate for the purposes of the act a sum of money at least equally as large as the federal subvention in favor of said state. (Sec. 12).

7. The chief educational authority of each state must report annually to the Secretary of Education showing the work done in said state in carrying out the provisions of the act. This act, however, shall not be construed to imply federal control of education within the states, nor to impair the freedom of the states in the conduct and management of their respective school systems. (Sec. 13).

8. A National Council on Education is created to consult and advise with the Secretary of Education on subjects relating to the promotion of education in the United States. (Sec. 17).

9. The Secretary of Education shall report annually to Congress giving an account of all moneys disbursed and received by the Department of Education, and describing the work done by the department. He shall make such recommendations to Congress as will, in his judgment, improve public education in the United States. He shall also conduct such special investigations and reports as may be required of him by the President or by Congress. (Sec. 18).

10. All acts or parts of acts in conflict with this act are repealed. (Sec. 19.).

FEDERAL AID CONSIDERED HISTORICALLY[1]

It will be profitable to note the principles already established by educational acts of Congress.

1. The Federal Government has established its right to encourage public schools by grants of land.

The Land Act of 1785 set aside Lot No. 16 in every township of the Northwest Territory for the maintenance of public schools within said townships. In 1848 this bounty was increased to two sections in each township. Under the first of these provisions, 640 acres in each township were given to each of twelve states; under the second provision, 1,280 acres in each township were given to each of sixteen states for public schools.

[1] National Education Association. The Towner-Sterling Bill. p. 25-6.

2. The Federal Government has established its right to encourage public schools by appropriation of money.

Oklahoma was given $50,000,000 when admitted as a state in lieu of certain sixteenth section lands, title to which was vested in the Indians.

3. The Federal Government has established its right to encourage the establishment of colleges and universities by grants of land and money.

This has been done repeatedly. The first form of grant was the traditional "two townships" beginning with the grant to the Ohio Company. Later came salt lands, internal improvement lands, swamp lands, and finally, lands for the endowment of Colleges of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts. The Hatch Act, the second Morrill Act of 1890, the Nelson Act, and the Adams Act have established the right to give money as well as lands for the maintenance and endowment of colleges.

4. The Federal Government has established its right to enter into cooperative arrangements with the states for specific educational purposes.

This is shown by the various acts relating to the endowment of colleges, and also, in the Smith-Lever and the Smith-Hughes Acts, in which definite cooperative relationships were set up for the purpose of encouraging education.

5. The Federal Government has established its right to encourage all kinds of educational and welfare work.

In 1921, the Federal Government, as is shown in a table on another page of this report, spent $149,608,482 for educational purposes. We have in the Department of Agriculture, the States Relations Service, and in the Department of Labor, the Children's Bureau, and also promotional agencies in other departments.

6. The Federal Government has established its right to promote the preparation of teachers.

The Smith-Hughes Act appropriates money "for the purpose of cooperation with the states in preparing teachers, supervisors, and directors of . . . (vocational) subjects."

7. The Federal Government has established its right to collect and disseminate information.

The Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, and Labor, and other departments, send out a great mass of such information yearly. The Bureau of Education in the Department of the

Interior has for years sent out bulletins containing educational information.

The foregoing acts of Congress have been in preparation for years, are now in operation, and have been undisturbed by any adverse court decision. They constitute, therefore, precedent sanctioned by law, and prove that the principle of federal aid for nationally desirable ends is clearly firmly established.

A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE MOVEMENT FOR THE RECOGNITION AND ENCOURAGEMENT OF PUBLIC EDUCATION BY THE NATIONAL GOVERNMENT [1]

There are now ten departments in the Federal Government, each under the direction of a secretary who is a member of the President's Cabinet. The first seven of these, considered in the order of their establishment, have executive charge of affairs over which the Federal Government has control under the provisions of the Constitution. The last three established, Agriculture, Commerce and Labor, deal with subjects not under the exclusive control of Congress, but which are promoted by the Federal Government. Neither agriculture nor education is mentioned in the Constitution. The National Government can control neither; in the interest of public welfare it can promote both. Constitutionally, they are in exactly the same relation.

Agriculture Promoted by National Government

The Department of Agriculture was established by act of Congress in 1862. It was created as an independent department under a commissioner who did not have a seat in the President's Cabinet. A study of the debates in Congress on the bill creating this department shows that there were members of Congress who felt that the Federal Government was exceeding its powers in undertaking to establish such a department. They pointed out that the power to control or regulate agriculture was not given to Congress and was, therefore, reserved exclusively to the states and to the people. These arguments were answered by other Congressmen who declared that it was entirely within the powers of the National Government to promote agriculture, because its development was so essential to the welfare of the

[1] By Hugh S. Magill, Field Secretary of the National Education Association. The Smith-Towner Bill: Legislation Commission Series. p. 3-5.

nation and of the people. They quoted Washington to show that he had recommended that the government promote the development of rural life and the agricultural interests of the country. They admitted that the Federal Government had no power to control agriculture but declared that the establishment of the department was for its promotion, not its control, and in the interest of public welfare.

After a thoro discussion of the subject, which was participated in by many of the greatest statesmen of that time, the bill was past by Congress and signed by President Lincoln. The department started out in a modest way but under able leadership. It grew rapidly in public confidence because of the valuable research work which it conducted and the information which it gathered and disseminated. In a few years the opposition had practically died out, and we find the members of Congress vying with each other in their praise of the valuable service which the department was rendering.

Department of Education Established in 1867

A few years after the establishment of the Department of Agriculture, a movement was started to create a Department of Education to be organized along similar lines. The first definite action was taken by the Department of Superintendence of the National Education Association at a meeting held in Washington, D.C., in 1866. A memorial was prepared and presented to Congress. James A. Garfield, then a member of the House of Representatives and later President of the United States, immediately espoused the cause and a bill was introduced to create such a department. The Congressional debates on this bill are particularly interesting. We find that many of the arguments used for and against the establishment of a Department of Education were similar to those which had been used for or against the creation of a Department of Agriculture five years before. The opponents of the measure insisted that the establishment of a Department of Education was too great an extension of federal power. The advocates of the measure referrred to the Department of Agriculture as a precedent, showed the splendid work which it had accomplished, and insisted that the promotion of education was of even greater importance.

Congressman Garfield, who had charge of the bill, quoted from William Penn, who a hundred years before the establish-

ment of our government, when working out his great plans for the establishment of a democratic colony in America, declared: "That which makes a good constitution must keep it, namely, men of wisdom and virtue; qualities that because they descend not with wordly inheritance must be carefully propagated by virtuous education of youth, for which spare no cost, for by such parsimony all that is saved is lost." In support of his argument that the promotion of education should receive the attention of the National Government he quoted from Horace Mann: "In our country and in our times no man is worthy the honorable name of statesman who does not include the highest practical education of the people in all his plans of administration."

Secretary of Education Advocated by Charles Sumner

The bill passed the House and went to the Senate where it was supported by statesmen prominent in American history. No very serious opposition was manifested in the Senate against the general proposition for the establishment of a Department of Education. The debate was largely upon whether it should be called a Department or a Bureau, and whether it should be an independent department like the Department of Agriculture, or be made a bureau in the Department of the Interior. It was decided to make it an independent department. Among those who earnestly supported the bill was Charles Sumner, of Massachusetts, whose scholarly eloquence had many times influenced the Senate. In a speech in support of the bill, delivered on February 26, 1867, he declared: "Call it then, I say, a Bureau, or call it a Department, but give us the bill and do not endanger it at this moment, at this late hour of the session by any unnecessary amendment. For myself, Sir, I would, if I could, give it the highest designation. If there is any term in our dictionary that would give it peculiar significance, I would prefer that. Indeed, I should not hestitate, if I could have my way, to place the head of the Department of Education in the Cabinet of the United States." A few days later the act was past by the Senate, approved by the President, and became a law.

History shows that the newly established Department of Education did not fare as well as the Department of Agriculture. Those not friendly to the development of public education became very jealous of its influence and did everything in their power to embarrass the commissioner and discredit the work of the department. The National Education Association

expressed its appreciation of the work of the department, but evidently took it for granted that it would be developed and extended as the Department of Agriculture had been. The friends of education failed to realize the subtle influence of the opposition which was working secretly to break down and discredit the department before it could demonstrate its great usefulness, as the Department of Agriculture had done, and thereby become thoroly established.

Foes of Public Education Destroy Department

As a result of this organized opposition, which has opposed the extension and development of public education in this country from the beginning, not only from the national standpoint but in the states and communities as well, we find that before the department was two years old a bill was slipped thru Congress abolishing it and transferring its functions to an office in the Department of the Interior. The salary of the commissioner was cut down and the annual appropriation for the work reduced from $20,000 to $6,000. And so the movement for the promotion and development of public education by carrying on extended research, disseminating useful information and giving encouragement and assistance to the states and to the people, was strangled at its very beginning. For more than fifty years, even down to the present time, education has remained without just recognition and with very inadequate support in a subordinate office of the Department of the Interior. The total appropriations for this office amount to less than $500,000 annually, more than half of which must be used to take care of the reindeer of Alaska, leaving less than $250,000 for the promotion of education thruout the United States.

Agriculture Promoted—Education Neglected

Let us turn for a moment to note the development of the Department of Agriculture during the years. It was fostered by Congress and generously supported by appropriations. It continued to expand and develop until it became one of the most important departments of the government. In 1899 it was elevated to equal rank with the other executive departments and the commissioner made secretary with a seat in the President's Cabinet. Since being placed on an equality with the other departments it has developed remarkably until it is now recognized as one of the most useful and important departments of the Federal Govern-

ment, carrying on a work which is not equaled by any similar department in the world. The annual appropriation for the Department of Agriculture is more than $30,000,000.

We find, therefore, that our Federal Government has followed the advice of Washington with respect to agriculture, but has permitted the foes of public education to prevent the carrying out of his advice with respect to education. Is it any wonder that we have become agriculturally the greatest nation in the world, providing not only for our own needs but feeding the hungry millions in nations less favored, while educationally we are humiliated by the fact that millions of American citizens cannot read intelligently the ballots they cast, each of which is supposed to register a freeman's will.

THE PREVALENCE OF ILLITERACY [1]

The accompanying table shows, according to the Federal census of 1920, that there were 4,931,905 illiterates ten years of age and over.

ILLITERATES IN THE UNITED STATES

1900	6,180,069
1910	5,516,163
1920	4,931,905

In twenty years the decrease has amounted to 1,248,164, or an average annual decrease of 62,408. If this rate of decrease continues, illiteracy will not disappear for eighty years. This is a discouraging prospect.

If we disregard the negro and consider the white population alone, we get less comfort, as the accompanying table shows.

WHITE ILLITERATES IN THE UNITED STATES

1900	3,200,746
1910	3,184,633
1920	3,006,312

There was a decrease of 194,434 in the number of white illiterates between 1900 and 1920, or an average annual decrease of 9,721. At this rate it would require three hundred and ten years to remove illiteracy from our white population. If it had not been for the war, which prevented the entrance into the country of the usual thousands of immigrant illiterates, the situation would be even more discouraging.

[1] National Education Association. The Towner-Sterling Bill. p. 27-33.

During this same twenty-year span, 1900 to 1920, the native white illiterates decreased from 1,913,611 to 1,242,572, or an average annual decrease of 33,552. At this rate, illiteracy among our native whites will not disappear until after a lapse of thirty-eight years.

NATIVE WHITE ILLITERATES IN THE UNITED STATES

1900	1,913,611
1910	1,534,272
1920	1,242,572

The number of illiterates of voting age in our population in 1920 was 4,333,111. This number is 16 per cent of the total vote at the 1920 Presidential Election. If the rate of reduction in the number of illiterates over twenty-one years of age, which took place between 1910 and 1920, is maintained, illiteracy will not disappear from among those over twenty years of age until one hundred and eighty years have passed. Now that the war is over, hundreds of thousands of aliens are once again entering our country each year.[1] The illiteracy law will decidedly cut down the number of illiterates admitted, but will not completely cut off the inflow of illiterates from this source, since certain exceptions in the law allow illiterates to be admitted to the country. In 1921, with the law in full effect, 27,463 illiterate immigrants were admitted.

It is well known that illiteracy does not disappear according to such regular decreases as have been assumed for illustration. It disappears only as the older illiterates are taught and as those who are under the age of ten are so taught that they do not become classed as illiterates. The complete elimination of illiteracy among the native-born whites and negroes is primarily a problem of education during the years of childhood—not a problem of adult training. One section of the Towner-Sterling Bill provides for teaching adult illiterates. Another section relates to the compulsory age of school children.

Illiteracy Principally Among Native-Born

When it is realized that of the 4,931,905 illiterates in the United States in 1920, 3,084,733 were native-born and 1,847,172 foreign-born, the problem is more clearly revealed as principally one of improving our schools. The problem of teaching adult

[1] One million, two hundred thousand entered in the two years, 1920 and 1921. Annual report of Commissioner General of Immigration, 1921. p. 27.

native-born illiterates will, under the Towner-Sterling Bill, be a constantly diminishing one.

Nor is the problem of illiteracy confined to any particular section of the country. The accompanying table shows that New York has more illiterates than any of the three southern states with the greatest number of illiterates, and that Pennsylvania contains more illiterates than any of the southern states, except Georgia. That the percentage of illiterates in New York state is smaller is beside the point. The fact remains that New York has the largest illiteracy problem in the United States.

NUMBER OF ILLITERATES, 1920

Northern states—	
New York	425,022
Pennsylvania	312,699
Illinois	173,987
Southern states—	
Georgia	328,838
Alabama	278,082
Mississippi	229,734

Although illiteracy has been reduced in numbers and percentage in the country as a whole, in many of our more important states, it has increased during the decade 1910-1920, as the table below shows, in spite of the fact that the inflow of illiterates from abroad was largely cut off due to the war. In every one of these states there was an actual increase in the number of illiterates and, for the twelve states, there was a total increase of 117,344.

Division and State	No. of illiterates 1920.	No. of illiterates 1910.
Massachusetts	146,607	141,541
Connecticut	67,265	53,665
New York	425,022	406,020
New Jersey	127,661	113,502
Ohio	131,006	124,774
Illinois	173,987	168,294
Michigan	88,046	74,800
Texas	295,844	282,904
Colorado	24,208	23,780
Arizona	39,131	32,953
Washington	18,526	18,416
California	95,592	74,902

It should also be remembered that the right of free movement between the states, guaranteed by the Constitution, makes the illiteracy problem of any state, the potential problem of every state

The 1910 census shows that 22 per cent of our native-born population was living in states other than those of their birth. Transportation is becoming easier in the United States with each succeeding year and we can look forward to a continual increase in inter-state migration. Illiteracy, therefore, cannot be looked upon as being confined to or as the special problem of any state or group of states. It must be looked upon as a matter of national concern and only a general effort among the states to meet it will be successful. In this fact is found the justification for the encouragement of the states through federal aid, as provided in the Towner-Sterling Bill.

Federal Census Understates Illiteracy Problems

All the figures thus far quoted in regard to the prevalence of illiteracy in the country are based upon the federal census. There is evidence to justify the belief that the federal census greatly underestimates the importance of this problem, due to the definition of illiteracy as made by those in charge of taking the census. In interpreting federal census figures it should be kept in mind that they are for what might be termed absolute illiterates. The following statements more clearly define this term.

1. No test to determine illiteracy is made by the census enumerator, but the statement of each person enumerated, or a statement made in his behalf by some member of his family or another person, is accepted by the enumerator.[1]
2. A statement of a foreigner that he is able to read and write in a foreign language is sufficient to cause him to be returned by the enumerator as a literate.[1]
3. The Census Bureau classifies as illiterate any person ten years of age or over who is unable to write in any language, . . . regardless of ability to read.[2]
4. In general the illiterate population as shown by the census reports should be understood as representing only those persons *who have had no schooling whatever.*[2]
5. . . . the "literate" population in this report should be understood as including all persons who have had even *the slightest amount of schooling.*[3]

An illiterate according to the federal census, therefore, is one who *confesses* to a total lack of schooling, or rather to a total lack of ability to write. On the other hand literates are defined as "persons who have had even the slightest amount of schooling."

[1] Quoted from communication from Mr. W. M. Steuart, Director of Census, dated April 13, 1922, directed to the National Education Association.

[2] Advance sheets from the Volume on Population. 1920 census. p. 4.

[3] Volume No. 1, 1910 census. p. 1185.

When this definition of illiteracy is fully comprehended, the statement that there were five million illiterates in 1920 has a new significance. There are doubtless many illiterates who, due to the fear of the stigma of illiteracy, falsify their statements to the enumerator. In Volume 1 of the 1910 census we find the following statement on this point: "There is undoubtedly a certain margin of error in the statistics of illiteracy. . . In some cases there may be unwillingness to admit illiteracy. . ."

That the federal census was an understatement of the real problem of illiteracy was known before the war. It was not until statistics on illiteracy resulting from the draft became available, however, that it was realized how far the federal census really hides the problem of illiteracy. The draft figures indicate that in addition to the five million absolute illiterates, there are many other millions who for all practical purposes are illiterates in that they fail to possess the ability to discharge those civic duties that involve the ability to read and write with a reasonable degree of facility. The Director of the Census clearly recognizes this fact. An inquiry on April 11, 1922, was addressed to Mr. W. M. Steuart, Director of the Census, from the National Education Association in which the following question was asked: "If literacy were to be defined as follows: 'The ability to read a simple newspaper article in some language with reasonable speed and comprehension and the ability to write a very simple friendly letter with reasonable speed and accuracy,' is it your belief that the figures given in the 1920 census are an understatement or overstatement of the number of illiterates in the United States?" Mr. Steuart, in reply dated April 13, 1922, over his signature, gave the following: "If illiteracy were defined as sugested by you . . . the census figures would *undoubtedly understate* the number of illiterates in the United States." (Italics ours.)

Revelations of Selective Draft Startling

But let us consider the facts concerning illiteracy as brought out by the draft examinations. In connection with the psychological tests, all men were segregated into two groups, literates and illiterates. A total of 1,552,256 men were examined during the draft. The men examined were distributed among twenty-eight camps located in every section of the country. The figures below give the summarized results.

Number of men examined.....	1,552,256
Per cent illiterate.....	24.9

The figures of the federal census show that in 1920, 6 per cent of the population over ten years of age were illiterate. The draft figures show that 24.9 per cent of all the men examined were illiterate. The principal cause of the difference between these two figures is probably the difference between the definitions of illiteracy of the census and of the draft. The meaning of illiteracy, according to the census, has been explained above. The meaning of illiteracy according to the draft may be inferred from the following, keeping in mind that literate men were supposed to take the Alpha examination and illiterate men, the Beta examination.

1. In general it may be said that many of the camps aimed at an "ability to read and understand newspapers and write letters home" as a basis for the Alpha examination, and that the figures for the number of men taking Beta do approximately reflect this level of literacy.[1]

2. The men in charge of segregating the recruits for the two examinations were practically all college trained and had special training for army examining.

3. In segregating the recruits into two groups, literates and illiterates, the examiners had in mind that the recruit had to be able to read sufficiently well so that he could do himself justice in a test involving the following type of reading matter:

Test 2—(Alpha Army Test)

Get the answers to these examples as quickly as you can. Use the side of this page to figure on if you need to.

Samples
1. How many are 5 men and 10 men? ..... Answer (15)
2. If you walk 4 miles an hour for 3 hours, how far do you walk? ..... Answer (12)

1. How many are 30 men and 7 men? ..... Answer ( )
2. If you save $7 a month for 4 months, how much will you save? ..... Answer ( )

and so on for 20 increasingly difficult problems.

4. Recruits not able to read and write in English were classed as illiterates and given the Beta examination.

Draft Figures Verified by Camp Investigations

The official report of Psychological Examining in the army

[1] Psychological Examining in the United States Army, official report of the Division of Psychology, under Surgeon General United States Army. p. 743.

contains, besides the total figures on illiteracy, representing combined figures from various camps, a number of studies of illiteracy made in individual camps. The results of one of these studies made in Camp Wadsworth is quoted as typical. This study, as well as those made in the other camps, was made under the direction of commissioned officers, all of whom were trained psychologists.

The percentage of illiterates for various localities represented in recent draft examinations is as follows:

Locality	Date of draft	Number examined	Number illiterate	Per cent illiterate
New York State	May 25, 1918	8,965	1,484	16.6
South Carolina	July 5, 1918	981	487	49.5
Minnesota	July 24, 1918	4,692	670	14.2

The above figures are most significant in the light of the fact that the drafted men from New York State include many foreigners. In spite of that fact the percentage of illiteracy (16.6) seems to be very small when compared with the percentage of illiteracy found among the men reporting from South Carolina. In fact, the percentage for the latter group was found to be so high as to make us doubt the accuracy of the data. A check was therefore made as follows: The records of all South Carolina men in one company were analyzed, with the result that of the 177 men in the company, 109, or 61.6 per cent, were illiterate. It seems from this check that the percentage of illiteracy (49.5 per cent) for the whole group from South Carolina is probably correct.

Such a percentage of illiteracy as is found among men from South Carolina is startling. Among Virginia negroes reporting at Camp Lee, Va., in the fall of 1917 the percentage of illiteracy was 40 per cent. The conclusion is that the problem of illiteracy among South Carolina drafted men is a most serious one.[1]

The unexpectedly high percentage of illiteracy found in various camps was similarly questioned in other camps in all sections of the country with the general result that searching studies revealed them to be substantially correct. The official report on the army tests summarized the whole situation regarding illiteracy by stating that "the extent of illiteracy among drafted men is a striking fact" and indicates "conditions of serious public concern."[2]

[1] Quoted from Psychological Examining in the United States Army, official report of the Division of Psychology, under Surgeon General United States Army. p. 746.

[2] Ibid. p. 743.

Illiteracy Impairs Effective Citizenship

The great difference between the figures for illiteracy given by the federal census and the army draft report is due principally to the difference in the definition of illiteracy as used in the two reports. It is not necessary to accept either one absolutely. The question of fundamental importance to the welfare of our nation is this: In a democracy in which universal suffrage is in force, can we longer safely disregard the facts that 6 per cent, or five million of our population, can be classed as absolute and confessed illiterates, and that 24.9 per cent of our young men are so limited in their literacy that they are unable "to read and understand newspapers and write letters home"? Fine distinctions as to the definitions of illiteracy and the exact percentage of illiteracy in our population are beside the point. The fact clearly exists that an alarming number of our citizens are so limited in their ability to read and write that they are obviously unable intelligently to discharge their civic duties. The condition would be less startling if it had not already been shown that any great reduction in the amount of illiteracy in the country is unlikely in the immediate future unless the Federal Government encourages the states to undertake its removal.

Less Illiteracy in Other Countries

The position of the United States in its tolerance of illiteracy is unique among the enlightened countries of the world. The following table gives the latest facts available for illiteracy in the principal enlightened nations of the world.

ILLITERACY IN THE UNITED STATES AND FOREIGN COUNTRIES [1]

Germany	.1%
Switzerland	.5%
Netherlands	.6%
Finland	.9%
Norway	1.0%
Sweden	1.0%
Scotland	3.5% [2]
France	4.9%
England	5.8% [2]
UNITED STATES	6.0%

[1] These data are from two sources: (*a*) Cubberley—History of Education. p. 714; (*b*) Communications from foreign legations received by National Education Association during April, 1922.

[2] The British Library of Information of New York states in 1922 "as far as England and Scotland are concerned, illiteracy is practically unknown except among a few quite old people who did not enjoy the benefits of compulsory education which has been in existence for years."

FOREIGN-BORN RESIDENTS [1]

According to the 1920 census, as the accompanying table shows, there were 13,920,692 foreign-born residents in the United States.

FOREIGN-BORN RESIDENTS IN THE UNITED STATES

1870	5,567,229
1880	6,679,943
1890	9,249,960
1900	10,341,276
1910	13,515,886
1920	13,920,692

Foreign-Born Population Increasing

The number of foreign-born has been steadily increasing with each succeeding decade; between 1910 and 1920 there was an increase amounting to 404,806. This was in spite of the fact that the war very decidedly cut down the number of alien immigrants admitted to the country during this decade, as the table below shows.

NUMBER OF ALIEN IMMIGRANTS ADMITTED YEARLY

1913	1,197,892
1914	1,218,480
1915	326,700
1916	298,826
1917	295,403
1918	110,618
1919	141,132
1920	430,001
1921	805,228
1922	355,825 [2]

Equally important with the increase in numbers is the change in the character of the immigrants who have been entering our country. About 1880 the character of immigrants changed in a very remarkable manner. Immigration from the north and west of Europe began declining abruptly and was replaced by an inflow of alien peoples from the south and east of Europe. This flow of people from southern Europe soon developed into a great stream.

[1] The National Education Association. The Towner-Sterling Bill. p. 34-7.
[2] Number fixed by immigration law of 1921.

Practically no Italians came to us before 1870, whereas in the five-year period beginning 1906, 1,186,000 arrived from that country alone.[1] In the decade between 1900 and 1910 there was a loss of 275,911 in the number of people coming from northwestern Europe, and an increase of 3,215,689 from southern and eastern Europe.

New Type of Immigrant Magnifies Problem

This enormous influx from countries in which little education exists and in which social and political ideals are so radically different from our own, gives a new significance to the ever-increasing number of aliens in our midst. The seriousness of the double problem created both by the increase in numbers and the change in character of our immigrants has been recognized by Congress, which in May, 1921, passed "An act to limit immigration of aliens into the United States." This act is described in the 1921 annual report of the Commissioner General of Immigration as "the first strictly immigration law which provides for actual limiting the number of aliens . . . admitted to the United States." This act brings with it a radical departure from our former immigration policy and yet it still allows 356,000 immigrants to enter our country each year, 153,000 of which may come from southern and eastern Europe. If this act had come twenty years ago, the country would not face the problem presented by the great mass of unassimilated southern and eastern European aliens within our borders at the present time. The door has been closed too late, however, and millions of these people are already with us and most of them are here to stay.

The percentage of illiteracy among the foreign-born is high, and the number of foreign-born illiterates within our borders has been rapidly increasing, as the accompanying table shows.

NUMBER OF ILLITERATE FOREIGN-BORN IN THE UNITED STATES

1900	1,287,135
1910	1,650,361
1920	1,763,740

In 1920 there were 1,500,000 people over ten years of age in the country who were unable to speak English. The number of illiterates and non-English-speaking aliens, however, is only a partial measure of the need for Americanization. One may be able to speak English sufficiently to pass the census enumerator,

[1] See Cubberley, Public Education in the United States. p. 337.

and yet not have that degree of literacy which means ability to comprehend the fundamental principles of our government. To understand and speak English is but a step in making it possible for the immigrant to participate in the conduct of our national affairs.

Many Native-Born Need Americanization

Nor is the need for Americanization limited to the foreign-born. The war brought home, for the first time to the average American citizen, the fact that foreign settlements, described as "alien islands," exist in various parts of our country. They are found both in the urban and rural sections. These people are often wholly out of sympathy with American ideals, but are not classed as aliens in any federal census, because often they are removed two or three generations from the original immigrants. In 1920 there were 16,784,299 people in the United States, one or both of whose parents were foreign-born. Millions of these constitute a problem of Americanization even more grave than that presented by the immigrant. Being native-born, they have the right of the ballot, and yet many of them attend foreign-language schools and retain the language and ideals of the country from which their parents or grandparents came. The problem that these un-American native Americans presented by their "hyphenated" activities during the war is still fresh in the minds of all well-informed Americans. That problem is no less serious today than it was during the war—only less apparent. Millions of people wholly uninformed and out of symapthy with American ideals are living in our country. Such a menace cannot be safely disregarded in peaceful times. We must not wait until in some National crisis this great mass of unassimilated citizenry turns the balance in the direction of disorder and anarchy. A recent report on Americanization compiled by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States sums up the situation in the following words:

It may truly be said that one result of the war was to bring home of the American people as a whole the importance of assimilating new-comers to this country. War-time investigations revealed a condition which but few outside of our social and civic agencies had realized, such as the existence of groups or colonies of unassimilated immigrants, unable to speak the language of their adopted country, and almost totally ignorant of its manners, customs and political and civic institutions.

Thus, we see that the Americanization problem is one resulting from the presence in the country of millions of both foreign- and native-born people, unassimilated so far as our language, ideals and customs are concerned.

MILLIONS TAUGHT BY UNQUALIFIED TEACHERS[1]

Of the twenty million boys and girls in the public schools during the war, it was conservatively estimated that—

One million are being taught by teachers whose education has been limited to seven or eight years in the elementary schools;

Seven million are being taught by teachers who are scarcely more than boys and girls themselves, and whose appreciation of their responsibilities must, in consequence of their youth and inexperience, be extremely slight;

Ten million are being taught by teachers who have had no special preparation for their work and whose general education is quite inadequate.

The seriousness of the shortage of teachers at the opening of the school year 1920 was revealed by investigations of the National Education Association.[2]

The Bureau of Education also issued a report showing that the shortage of teachers was alarming. On the basis of these studies it was estimated that there were approximately eighteen thousand classrooms for which teachers could not be found, and that there were four hundred and fifty thousand boys and girls, in one school year, to whom school privileges were denied. So much for conditions existing during the war.

Since the war a number of surveys have been made which furnish data concerning the preparation of teachers. A survey of Kentucky for the year 1921, shows that "only one elementary teacher in ten is satisfactorily prepared to teach in the elementary school . . . 23 per cent have never gone beyond the elementary school."[3]

[1] National Education Association. The Towner-Sterling Bill. p. 47-9.

[2] See Report by Hugh S. Magill in N. E. A. Bulletin. November, 1920. p. 15-16.

[3] Public Education in Kentucky. General Education Board. p. 53.

A more comprehensive study, the results of which are given in a table below, gives an estimate of the teacher training situation in twenty-eight of the states in the country.

PREPARATION OF TEACHERS [1]

STATES	Per cent less than high school training	Per cent high school education or more	Per cent 2 years college or normal school
Alabama	59	41	10
Arizona	0	100	89
Arkansas	87	13	12
California	0	100	86
Connecticut	0	100	90
Florida	94	6	1
Iowa	0	100	30
Idaho	0	100	42
Kansas	26	74	42
Louisiana	15	85	67
Massachusetts	7	99	86
Mississippi	76	24	4
Missouri	30	70	34
Montana	23	77	34
Nebraska	39	61	4
New Mexico	73	27	18
New York	0	100	82
North Carolina	51	49	23
Ohio	8	92	42
Oklahoma	73	27	22
Oregon	0	100	79
Pennsylvania	23	77	67
South Carolina	40	60	35
South Dakota	39	61	34
Utah	0	100	69
Vermont	6	94	29
Washington	0	100	50
West Virginia	67	33	18

A few of the outstanding facts brought out by this table follow:

1. Only nine of the twenty-eight states listed have no teachers who have had less than a high-school education.

2. In eight states of the Union over 50 per cent of the

[1] School and Society. March 18, 1922. p. 304.
(Ed. Note.—First item after Massachusetts should probably be "1 per cent..")

teachers have had less than a high-school education; in Florida 94 per cent have had less than a high school education.

3. In eighteen of the twenty-eight states less than one-half of the teachers have had a normal-school education.

It is not necessary to give further data in support of the generally recognized fact that the composition of the teaching population of the country is below the standard that our Nation should expect as to maturity, experience, and training.

Present indications are not encouraging in indicating any great improvement in the personnel of the teachers of the country in the immediate future. A recent report has shown that in spite of the "large increases in salaries given the teachers in the school years ending 1919 and 1920 that they are in a less advantageous economic position than at any other time since the civil war period." [1]

Even in the cities, where the salary increases have been the greatest, teachers' salaries have barely held their own against the increased cost of living.[2]

In the rural communities the salaries of teachers are still pitifully inadequate. Data based upon a recent salary inquiry sent to all rural communities of the country by the Bureau of Education, furnish evidence for the following statements:

1. Seventeen thousand teachers were reported as receiving annual salaries less than $500.

2. Approximately forty thousand teachers would have been reported as receiving less than $500 annual salary, if all rural communities had replied and their returns had been similar to those actually received.

3. In ten states from 25 to 64 per cent of the teachers in rural communities receive salaries of less than $500 annually, and hundreds of teachers received an annual salary of less than $300.

Under such conditions it is unlikely that there will be a great increase in the number of men and women desiring to enter the teaching profession, or that the standard of their preparation will be appreciably raised. In fact there is some evidence to show that the standard of preparation is lower now than during the war. A recent study of the preparation of high-school

[1] Trends of School Costs. Russell Sage Foundation. p. 64.

[2] Have Teachers' Salaries Been Increased? Journal of the National Education Association. April, 1922. p. 172.

teachers, who receive the best salaries of any of our public-school teachers, shows that the proportion of high-school teachers who were graduates of colleges in the school year ending 1921 was lower in every state in the Union except four, than it was in the school year ending 1918.[1]

In the school year 1917-18, before the effects of the war upon our normal-school enrolment had been serious, there were approximately twenty-five thousand graduates from the normal schools of the United States each year.[2] During the war there was a great decrease in the number of normal-school graduates. Only recently has the number of normal-school attendants returned to that of the pre-war figure. There is a very remote prospect that the number of normal-school graduates will, under present conditions, ever be anywhere near the demand for new teachers that comes every year.

The Federal Commissioner of Education estimated that the number of recruits needed in the rural schools of the country alone, for the year 1918-19, was one hundred and thirty thousand. It will be seen, therefore, that the number of normal-school graduates was but a small fraction of the number of new teachers needed every year. The Federal Commissioner of Education estimates that there was an annual turnover of more than one in three. If this holds true for 1921-22, it means that for the coming school year over two hundred thousand new teachers will be needed. Our teacher-training institutions will graduate less than a fourth of this number.

EQUALIZING EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY[3]

Abraham Lincoln expressed the hope that the time would come when our country would "guarantee to all an unfettered start and a fair chance in the race of life." How far we have fallen short in attaining this great ideal is familiar to all who are acquainted with the facts concerning the educational situation in the country.

The accompanying table shows the percentage of illiteracy,

[1] The Journal of the National Education Association. April, 1922. p. 170.

[2] Statistics of Normal Schools. 1917-18. United States Bureau of Education Bulletin. No. 81. 1919.

[3] National Education Association. The Towner-Sterling Bill. p. 51-6.

divided as to rural or urban residence, in nine states selected to represent each geographic section of the country.

PERCENTAGE OF ILLITERATES IN RURAL AND URBAN COMMUNITIES—1920 CENSUS

State	Native white Percentage illiterate			Negro Percentage illiterate		
	Rural	Urban	Ratio, rural to urban	Rural	Urban	Ratio, rural to urban
Rhode Island.	2.4	.6	4 to 1	11.8	10.2	1.1 to 1
New Jersey .	1.2	.3	4 to 1	9.1	5.4	1.7 to 1
Wisconsin	.9	.3	3 to 1	4.1	4.1	1. to 1
Missouri	2.9	.7	4.1 to 1	20.6	9.6	2.1 to 1
Florida	4.1	.7	5.8 to 1	27.4	12.3	2.2 to 1
Kentucky	8.6	1.9	4.5 to 1	23.0	18.9	1.2 to 1
Louisiana	16.3	2.0	8.1 to 1	45.4	22.1	2.1 to 1
Colorado	2.1	.6	3.3 to 1	10.0	5.5	1.8 to 1
California	.7	.2	3 to 1	8.6	4.2	2.0 to 1

This table shows that illiteracy among our native-born population is from 2 to 8 times as great in the rural as in the urban communities. In the state of Louisiana, for example, among the white population, illiteracy is 8 times as frequent in rural as in urban communities. Considering negroes, in the same state, there is twice as large a percentage of illiterates in the rural communities as in the urban. It is plain, therefore, that the illiteracy of the more than three million native-born residents of the United States, is primarily a rural problem, or more exactly, a rural school problem. Over 60 per cent of our illiterates are native-born, and over 80 per cent of our illiterate native population are found in rural communities. The inequalities in our educational system represented by our ineffective rural schools may, therefore, be held principally responsible for the existence of our present illiteracy problem.

Many Children Deprived of Educational Opportunities

The children of many states do not have an equal opportunity to acquire that most elemental educational attainment, the ability to read and write. Whether a child is to reach maturity possessing this fundamental educational attainment is in many states largely a matter of chance. If he happens to be reared in a rural community, his chance of being an illiterate is, in

some states, eight times as great as if he lived in a city during childhood.

The length of the school term maintained in the different local communities of any state is another good indication as to how near that state comes to providing equal educational opportunities for its children. It is obvious that any educational opportunity is dependent upon keeping the schools in session.

The table below shows the inequalities in the length of school terms maintained in different counties of Colorado as revealed by a recent study:

LENGTH OF SCHOOL TERM—COLORADO COUNTIES [1]

Name of county	School term in days
Crowley	167
Cheyenne	151
Pueblo	141
Montezuma	133
Baca	98

Similar data are given for Virginia:

SCHOOL TERMS IN VIRGINIA—NON-CITY SCHOOLS [2]

Length of school term in months	Number of schools maintaining term
5 or less	65
6	226
7	226
8	148
9	36
Over 9	7
Total	748

Conditions recently found in Kentucky are well summed up in the following quotation taken from a survey of Kentucky Schools, completed in 1921:

. . . the actual rural school term is approximately 113 days. This inadequate school term places rural children at a great disadvantage as compared with their less numerous contemporaries in city and graded districts. For example, in the graded and city school districts children have, as a rule, during the eight

[1] Common School Finance in Colorado, and Certain Inferences of National Import. F. H. Swift. Journal of Educational Research. November, 1920. p. 746.

[2] Virginia Public Schools. Report of Virginia Education Survey Staff. p. 293.

years of the elementary course a total of 72 months of schooling, whereas rural children have ordinarily only 48 months. Working under this handicap, county children must either do one-third more work in a given period than graded and city school children, or take twelve instead of eight years to complete the elementary school program. Few rural children are able to remain in school so long, and few are able to do more in a given period than their graded school and city cousins. *The result is that rural school children actually receiving on the average even less than two-thirds as much elementary education as graded and city school children.*[1] (Italics ours.)

Striking Inequalities Within States

Variations in the quality of teachers provided in different communities of the same state are similarly striking. In Massachusetts, to select a state in which the support of the schools is provided principally by the local community, in the present school year the following inequalities exist in the compensation of teachers:

MASSACHUSETTS' AVERAGE TEACHERS' SALARIES[2]

Population of community	Average annual salary
Over 100,000	$1,589
Villages and towns	1,126
One-teacher rural schools	391

It must be considered that the child taught by a teacher who can be obtained for an annual salary of $391 is not receiving an opportunity equal to that received by the child taught by a teacher paid an annual salary of $1,589. Similar inequalities, greater or less, exist in every state in the Union in 1921-22.[3]

Equality of Opportunity Denied

The conditions revealed by these tables indicate that equality of educational opportunity is a myth in many states. But in all these states at least some schooling is offered. The quotation given below for Arkansas shows that in that state no schooling whatsoever is being offered the children in many communities.

In 1920, 120 Arkansas school districts levied no school tax at all. In 1921 something over 70 pursued the same policy. The average school year per county varied all the way from

[1] Public Education in Kentucky. Report of Kentucky Educational Commission. p. 87-8.

[2] Journal of National Education Association. May, 1922. p. 216.

[3] Ibid. p. 216.

8 to 3 months. Needless to say that multitudes of schools in the counties whose average was 3 months maintained schools for one month and many schools were not opened at all. In the best communities in Arkansas, schools frequently would close in December except for the fact that they were maintained by the proceeds of private subscriptions and tuition fees.

There are in Arkansas, eleven cities of 10,000 and over. In reply to an inquiry sent out in November, 1921, four of these eleven cities reported that their schools were in debt for maintenance the equivalent of one year's income or more. Six of the eleven replied that they charged tuition or raised money by other unusual means.[1]

These data are sufficient to show that children of the United States are not given even approximately equal educational opportunities. If there is no equality in such fundamental provisions as have been dealt with above, there can be no equality in less essential educational provisions.

There is a fundamental cause back of practically every illustration of the lack of equality of educational opportunity found within a state. This is the lack of a sound basis of finance for our state public schools. In 1920, 78 per cent of the income for our public schools came from purely local sources.[2] Furthermore, the percentage of school expenditures coming from local sources has been steadily increasing.

Schools Supported Principally by Local Communities

Consequently in most states our schools are supported principally by the local community. Whether a school will be well supported is fundamentally dependent upon the ability of the local community to support it. That different communities vary enormously in ability to support their schools has been shown by numerous studies. Below is given the result of a recent study made in Indiana:[3]

There is the sum of $22,086 of taxable property in one county for each person enumerated for school purposes as against $1,873 in another county, or $11.70 of taxables in the former county per each child enumerated for school purposes as against $1 in the latter county.

There is such an unequal distribution of wealth in Indiana

[1] Professor Fletcher Harper Swift. University of Minnesota, quoted from communication to National Education Association. April 20, 1922.

[2] Based on figures furnished by United States Bureau of Education. (manuscript not yet printed).

[3] What Is Needed to Advance Indiana's School System from 17th to 1st Place. Pamphlet issued by Indiana Educational Campaign Committee.

that some corporations are able to maintain their schools with a local tuition tax of 5 cents on each $100 of taxables, while other townships cannot maintain their schools the minimum term upon a local tuition tax of 75 cents, the legal maximum. This condition requires one citizen of Indiana to bear a tax burden fifteen times greater than that borne by another Indiana citizen for the education of his children.

It is little wonder under such a situation that the following conditions exist in this same state:[1]

The school term in a few Indiana counties is nine months; in some others it is eight months; in most others seven months; in many others six months; while in some townships it has been less than one hundred twenty days.

There are thousands of Indiana boys and girls not within reasonable reach of a standard high school. Because of the financial conditions of their parents, poor conditition of roads and streams, and the scarcity of high schools in their counties, many of them may never hope to obtain a high school education, while in other counties there is a high school within easy reach of every pupil so that he can attend school and remain at home with his parents.

Is it any wonder that 90 per cent of the eighth grade graduates in some counties enter the high school as against 18 per cent of the eighth grade graduates in other counties?

Another recent study made in Iowa shows that one city in order to support its schools must levy a tax of $15.08 on each $1,000, whereas another city in this state supports its schools on a tax of $1.30 on each $1,000 of taxable property. We also find that some cities in Iowa are spending as high as $125.80 a year for each pupil, whereas others spend as little as $37.95.

Similar conditions revealed by a study in Pennsylvania are given below:

AMOUNT OF MONEY BEHIND EACH CHILD FOR SCHOOL PURPOSE—

SIX PENNSYLVANIA COUNTIES[2]

County	
Fulton	$1,260
Sullivan	2,010
Clearfield	2,110
Lancaster	5,190
Northampton	5,320
Delaware	7,650

[1] *Ibid.*

[2] The Nation and the Schools. Keith and Bagley. p. 255.

Some counties in Pennsylvania have over six times as much wealth to tax for school purposes as other counties according to this table. Similar inequalities between towns and districts within the same county may be found in Pennsylvania, with the resulting inequalities in the educational opportunity offered.[1]

So long as such conditions exist there will never be equality of educational opportunities offered the children of the Nation. That there is no equality in educational opportunity is a matter of national concern. The Nation is the sufferer in a very real sense. Children reaching maturity illiterate, and otherwise inadequately educated, cannot but be a handicap to the progress of the Nation. The situation is even more deserving of attention since under present conditions there is little hope of improvement. The part of the financial burden of supporting the schools that is being placed upon the purely local communities, as opposed to the county and state, is increasing. The table below shows this clearly:

Year	Per cent of school revenue[2] from local taxes
1890	68
1900	67
1910	72
1918	78
1920	78

The provision of equal educational opportunities is fundamentally dependent on placing a smaller and smaller financial responsibility upon the local community within the state. Any means that will encourage the states to equalize educational opportunities within their borders should be welcomed.

THE FUNDAMENTAL ISSUES INVOLVED[3]

A discussion of the provisions of the Towner-Sterling Bill involves the consideration of the following questions:

1. Should the Federal Government increase the effective operation of its existing educational activities by unifying them

[1] Ibid. p. 259.

[2] Statistics of State School Systems, 1917-18. United States Bureau of Education Bulletin. No. 11. p. 54. 1920.

[3] National Education Association. The Towner-Sterling Bill. p. 5-9.

in a Department of Education under a Secretary of Education, and thereby give new sanction and recognized leadership to American public education?

2. Should the Federal Government extend the established principles of federal aid to the states for the promotion of education to encourage and assist the states to remedy certain recognized educational defects existing quite generally throughout the country?

3. Should the conduct and management of public education remain exclusively under state control?

The supporters of the bill believe that wise public policy demands that each of these three questions should be answered in the affirmative.

Opposition Based on False Assumptions

Those who have opposed the creation of a Department of Education and further participation of the Federal Government in the promotion of public education base their objections primarily on the assumption that such participation means federal control of education within the states. They will not concede that the National Government can cooperate with the states in promoting an interest of the highest importance to both state and nation. They refuse to recognize that such cooperation has been carried on, and is now being carried on successfully. They declare that those who favor the establishment of a Department of Education, and the extension of the principle of federal aid to the states for the promotion of education, would transfer the responsibility for the support and control of public education from the state and local communities within the state, to the Federal Government, and place the school systems of all the states under a vicious bureaucratic control.

We maintain that these assumptions are without foundation. They can be maintained only by imputing motives that do not exist to those who favor extension of federal participation in the promotion of education, and by refusing to give proper consideration to past experiences and to constitutional and statutory provisions prohibiting federal control.

Constitution Forbids Federal Control

It is conceded that our Federal Government can exercise only such powers as are delegated to it by the United States

Constitution or clearly implied therein; that the Constitution does not give to the Federal Government or to Congress the control or management of public education within the states; and that the Tenth Amendment to the Constitution expressly provides that "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the states, are reserved to the states respectively, or to the people." The recent decision of the Supreme Court declaring invalid the Child Labor Law gives added emphasis to this provision of the Constitution. Those who favor the extension of federal participation in education clearly recognize these facts. The proposed measure which they advocate would embody in statute law the clearest possible declaration of the authority of the states to manage and control their public school systems.

Why Such Unreasonable Assertions

Under these conditions it is difficult to understand why the opponents of the further participation of the Federal Government in the promotion of education should persist in declaring that such participation will mean "a great bureaucratic machine at Washington, with three-quarters of a million of federal employees teaching in the schools and bossed by several thousand field inspectors, supervisors, and other petty traveling officials." We insist that such assumptions and imaginings are absolutely unjustified. Starting with a false hypothesis and basing their arguments on false assumptions, they would lead us to believe that those who favor federal promotion of education would either ignorantly or wilfully bring about conditions disastrous to our free institutions.

Extent and Character of Support

We find earnestly supporting this proposition to establish a Department of Education and extend the principle of federal aid for the promotion of education, an overwhelming majority of these engaged in the work of public education—state superintendents, county superintendents, normal school presidents, city superintendents, and classroom teachers throughout the country. It is also earnestly supported by many national organizations that are friends of public education. Among these organizations may be named the National Education Association, which represents the professional organization of the educators

of the country, and which has repeatedly endorsed this proposition. Among the women's organizations actively supporting it are the General Federation of Women's Clubs, the National League of Women Voters, the Daughters of the American Revolution, the National Congress of Mothers and Parent-Teachers Associations, the National Council of Jewish Women, the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and the Woman's Relief Corps. The proposition also has the unqualified support of the American Federation of Labor. Great religious forces such as the International Sunday School Council of Religious Education have given the proposition their endorsement, and it is also supported by a number of fraternal organizations that are particularly friendly to the promotion of public education, among which may be named the Supreme Council of Scottish Rite Masonry for the Southern Jurisdiction of the United States. Finally, the National Committee for a Department of Education, made up of a number of leading public-spirited citizens, representing various professional and business interests, is given effective support to the cause.

Forces Opposing the Proposition

To say that the officers and members of these great organizations would violate the Constitution of the United States and either ignorantly or deliberately bring about federal bureaucratic control of education within the states, is an attempt on the part of a few to indict the motives and the judgment of millions of intelligent patriotic citizens. It is only fair that attention be called to the forces which are opposing the proposition to further extend federal aid for the promotion of education. We find this opposition comes primarily from the representatives of private and parochial schools, and a few great privately endowed institutions. We believe it may truthfully be said that the proposition is quite generally supported by those who are interested primarily in public education, and are essentially public-school minded, and opposed by a limited number of those who represent privately supported and privately endowed institutions. It is significant, however, that the departments of education in privately endowed universities, which are in touch with the problems of public education, generally support the proposition.

Opposition Pictures Tyranny of Free Government

It is astonishing to note the extremes to which the opponents of this proposition have gone in undertaking to picture in their imagination the dire consequences which will follow the further participation of the Federal Government in the promotion of education. They would frighten us into thinking that federal participation means federal control, and that federal control must end in the destruction of our liberties. In frantic appeal we are called upon as American citizens to save ourselves from the tyranny and usurpation of our own government, which, we are warned, is developing conditions "that will put to shame the best efforts of the government of the Czar of all the Russias when in the heyday of its glory." A tyranny worse than that of the Czar! A terrible indictment, if it were true. But we still have faith in our National Government and refuse to be frightened by this terrible warning of impending tyranny. We have confidence that our Nation will continue to be what it has been from the beginning, a government of the people and by the people; and since it is the people's own government, the people may well have greater faith in its leadership than in leadership furnished by private institutions, endowed and supported by great private interests.

Opponents Set Up Autocratic Secretary

Those who oppose the creation of a Department of Education with a Secretary in the President's Cabinet would continue their policy of frightfulness by picturing in their wild flights of imagination the horrible spectacle of a Secretary of Education, actuated by base political motives, corrupting the youth of the country through such wicked influences as he might be able to exert through the school systems of the several states. Such assumptions are too ridiculous to impress any serious-minded person. Any President might reasonably be expected to be particularly careful in the selection of a Secretary of Education. The occupant of this position of great responsibility must stand out prominently before the people, his every act and recommendation subject to public analysis and criticism. To begin to do some of the things that have been suggested he might do, would bring instant and general rebuke from the people, without regard to political affiliations. As one United

States Senator remarked, "To undertake to play politics in this position would be the poorest kind of politics." But why should anyone impune the motives of a Secretary of Education in advance? Is it any more just or reasonable than to condemn in advance the Secretary of Agriculture or the Secretary of Commerce? To refuse to establish leadership and delegate authority because of such imaginary fears would make impossible the realization of the highest purposes of free government.

No One Advocating Federal Control

Who is advocating federal control of education? Certainly not those who are supporting the proposition to establish a Department of Education and extend the established principle of federal aid for the promotion of education. They are the ones who are most strongly opposed to federal control of education within the states. What they seek is federal aid and cooperation with the states in developing a stronger, better trained, more intelligent American citizenship. Is it reasonable to suppose that state superintendents would wish to turn over to the Federal Government their rights and prerogatives? And yet state superintendents favor this proposition because they recognize the advantages which have come from federal cooperation with the states in the past, and the still greater advantage which will be derived from the further extension of this principle.

Proposition Based on Established Principles

There is nothing new in this proposition. It has been thoroughly tried out and found absolutely sound in principle and practice. Other departments have been established to cooperate with the states in promoting interests of national importance. The Department of Agriculture was created in response to a demand from the agricultural interests of the country, not to control agriculture but for the promotion of agriculture, and the benefits which have resulted therefrom are apparent. The Department of Labor was created at the request of the labor interests of the country, not to control labor but to promote the interests of labor, and so one can show that federal domination has followed. The Department of Commerce was created at the request of the commercial interests of the country for the promotion of commerce. The good which this depart-

ment has accomplished is well known. Why deny to public education for its welfare and promotion a similar recognition?

Many Precedents for Federal Aid

The Federal Government has cooperated with the states in the promotion of education from the founding of our Nation. Common schools have been promoted by grants of land and money from the Federal Government. Colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts were founded by land-grants given by the Federal Government and are today aided by grants of money from the federal treasury. Agricultural education is encouraged and promoted by the cooperation of the Federal Government with the states under the Smith-Lever Act, and vocational education is similarly promoted under the Smith-Hughes Act.

Causes of Friction Eliminated

Any friction that has arisen in the administration of these acts has come from the fact that they authorize too much detailed supervision. These defects have been remedied in the Towner-Sterling Bill under which it is proposed to extend the principle of federal aid. While there is preserved to the Federal Government the unquestioned right to audit the expenditure of such funds as may be apportioned to the state for the specific purposes named, and while certain general and very reasonable statutory requirements are set up which must be complied with by the states in order to receive the Federal grants, all details of organization, supervision and control are reserved to the states, to be carried on under state law by the state and local educational authorities of the several states.

REPORT OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION [1]

Analysis and General Considerations

The bill creates a Department of Education with a secretary at its head, who shall be a member of the President's Cabinet. The first six sections of the bill provide for the organization of this department. There are many reasons why this should be

[1] House of Representatives Report No. 1201, 66th Congress, 3d session. p. 7-12. January 17, 1921.

done. It is generally admitted that the education of its citizens is the most important work in which a government can engage. This is especially true in a republic. A nation can be properly governed only when it is intelligently governed. While the United States is more dependent than almost any other nation upon education for the successful conduct of its government, it is about the only nation in the world that has not given education primary recognition, for nearly all the other nations have departments or ministries of education with their heads members of the Cabinet.

Early in our history we began making appropriations to the states in lands and money for educational purposes. We have undertaken the work both directly and indirectly. There are now thirty or more different parts of the government service doing educational work, and we are annually making large appropriations from the national treasury for their support. Yet the only recognition we have given education at the seat of government is the establishment of a small bureau in the Department of the Interior. There is no coordination of the various educational activities of the government. There is no head to direct the work. The Commissioner of Education has no authority over the educational work of the government outside his own bureau, which has but a subordinate place, supported by only small appropriations. To concentrate and coordinate this work will make both for efficiency and economy. To give to education the recognition in the federal system which its importance merits is one of the principal objects of the bill.

Aid From the Federal Treasury

The remaining sections of the bill provide for the authorizations of appropriations from the federal treasury to aid and encourage the states in particular branches of educational work which are especially urgent. These authorizations for appropriations are made contingent upon the states appropriating an amount at least equally as large for the same purpose. The particular branches of educational work to be thus aided and encouraged are the removal of illiteracy, the Americanization of immigrants, the equalization of educational opportunities, the promotion of physical education, and the preparation of teachers.

Illiteracy

The extent of illiteracy in the United States is so great as to amount not only to a national disgrace but a national menace as well. According to the census of 1910, there were in the United States 5,500,000 persons ten years of age and over who could not read or write any language. In addition there were 3,500,000 who could not speak, read, or write English. These statistics put us in ninth place among the nations, with most of the civilized world ahead of us. The disclosures of the last census as to illiteracy are not yet available, but it is believed that the percentage of illiteracy has not been substantially reduced since 1910.

Our alarming condition was graphically disclosed by the examination of the draft registrants during the late war. The Surgeon General's report showed that of the men called to service between the ages of twenty-one and thirty-one nearly 25 per cent were practically illiterate. The Nation's defense is thus doubly impaired. First, because one-fourth of the sons of America called to serve are incapacitated for efficient service by being so ignorant and illiterate that they cannot even understand the orders given them; and, second, because in a free country its safety is jeopardized when its voters cannot read the ballots they cast and only know how to vote as they are told.

The economic loss is tremendous. Secretary Lane estimated the annual loss to the Nation because of illiteracy alone at $825,000,000. The Director of the Bureau of Mines states that of the 1,000,000 men engaged in mining in the United States 620,000 are foreigners, and that 460,000 of these cannot speak English. He states that the removal of illiteracy among the miners would save annually 1,000 lives and 150,000 injuries. Investigation has shown that one-half the industrial accidents are the result of ignorance, because the workers cannot read the danger warnings or understand the orders given.

It has been said that illiteracy is a southern problem. The facts do not warrant that conclusion. Georgia has 389,000 illiterates, but New York has 406,000. Alabama has 352,000, while Pennsylvania has 354,000. Louisiana has 352,000, Mississippi 290,000, and Texas has 282,000, but Illinois has 168,000, Ohio 124,000, and New Jersey 113,000. Even Massachusetts

has 141,000, and undertakes to partially solve her illiteracy problem by depriving them of the right to vote.

It is thought by many that illiteracy is a race question. But it is much more than that. There are over 1,000,000 more white illiterates in the United States than illiterate negroes.

Americanization

Closely allied with the problem of the removal of illiteracy is the Americanization of our foreign-born. We have now more than 15,000,000 foreign-born population in the United States. More than 5,000,000 cannot read or write the English language. More than 2,000,000 cannot read or write any language. This mass of ignorance is not merely a negative evil; it has become and is now an active source of danger to the republic. Alien communities where our language is not spoken, where our magazines and newspapers are not read, and where no American ideals or any understanding of our institutions are made known constitute a rich soil in which are sown the seeds of unrest and revolt. Alien agitators who advocate the destruction of our government, whose only purpose in coming to our shores is to excite revolution by violence, find here their opportunity. These revoluntionists whom we have mistakenly allowed to come to this country easily win the confidence of their countrymen and easily lead them astray. Most of the difficulties among foreign workingmen have their origin in the evil work of these foreign malcontents and trouble makers.

There is but one cure for these conditions, and that is to educate the immigrant to understand our language, our government, and our institutions. We are ourselves largely to blame. We admit the foreigner on easy terms and then let him shift for himself. We should surround him from the first with an atmosphere of helpful and patriotic influence. We should teach him to know what a free government is and what America really means. A man cannot love a country which he does not understand. He cannot appreciate and cherish institutions which are incomprehensible to him.

The task of the Americanization of immigrants, as well as that of the removal of illiteracy, is very largely an adult problem. The children we hope will be cared for in the schools. But there are few schools and few facilities of any kind for the education of grown men and women. That fact makes the

problem more difficult, and accounts in part for the delay and reluctance of the states to meet the demand. But the difficulty must be faced. It is the duty of both the states and the Nation to meet it, and it is hoped that by an effective cooperation in the work we may be able within a few years to materially better the conditions that now exist.

Equalizing Educational Opportunities

Provision is made for an appropriation to encourage the states to equalize educational opportunities for the youth of the land. That great inequalities exist within and among the states is well known. In the south a large proportion of the negro children never see the inside of a schoolhouse. In the north there is hardly a city that has adequate school facilities for all its children. In some rural communities and factory districts the value of the property is so small that local taxation cannot support the schools. In other sparsely settled communities means must be provided to carry pupils to central schools. The differences between the city and country schools are marked. On an average the country boy has two months less of a school year than the city boy. Through the eight grades this amounts to one year and four months' advantage given the city boy over the country boy.

Unfortunately it is found that where the educational needs are greatest the schools are most inadequate. All over our land the poorest schools are in the poorest communities—just where the best schools are most needed. Through national cooperation with the states and the local communities these unfortunate conditions can be largely remedied. It should be the Nation's task to so encourage the states and cooperate with them that every child in America, whether born in a city or in a remote rural district, shall have the advantage of at least a common-school education. The idea is fundamentally sound that the Nation, the state, and the local community should share in the responsibility and the expense of supporting an adequate and equalized system of public education.

Physical Education

The Provost Marshal General's report revealed the startling fact that more than one-third of the men examined for military service in the late war were disqualified by reason of physical

disability. It is also stated that 90 per cent of these hundreds of thousands of young men thus classed as physical defectives unfit for military service could have qualified had they been taught the application of the simplest rules of hygiene and health. It was ignorance, gross ignorance, that in the vast majority of cases was the cause of their incompetence.

If one-third of our young men are diseased and unfit to fight for their country, they are unfit to make their full contribution to the life and progress of the Nation. They cannot bring to their families, to the community, or to the Nation a man's share of its obligation and service. In a double sense physical education is a national interest. Not only because a physical defective is a burden to the Nation, but because it is as necessary to have sound men as it is to have effective guns and ammunition for the Nation's defense. The addition to the dynamic power of the Nation, the strengthening of all the forces that make not only for national defense but for progress, even the increase of moral strength that would come from observance of the fundamental principles of healthful living, are incalculable.

There is but one adequate and sensible course to adopt and put into operation as part of our school curriculum, a system of physical education in its broadest and best sense. Unfortunately this has not been generally done. The additional cost deprives many schools and thousands of children of this essential element of education, with the unfortunate results already referred to. As the Nation has an immediate interest in the physical fitness of its citizens, it is only proper it should bear a part of the expense and do something toward stimulating the activity of the states in this regard.

Preparation of Teachers

It is generally admitted by those who have given thought to the subject that the most pressing educational problem in America is how to overcome the difficulty of securing competent teachers for our schools. Thousands of schools are closed because teachers cannot be obtained. Tens of thousands of schools are taught by incompetent teachers. Over 100,000 teachers now teaching American youth are less than twenty years old; 30,000 have no education beyond the eighth grade;

200,000 have less than a high-school education; 300,000 have no professional training whatever.

The principal cause of this is that teachers have been paid less wages than almost any other class engaged in private or public service. The average salary paid teachers in the United States last year was $640. This is less than the wages paid scrub women or ditch diggers. It is only a fraction of the amount paid mechanics. It must be manifest that such conditions will drive all competent and self-respecting teachers from their work. It is certainly the duty of the people of the United States to bring up to at least a scale of reason and justice the salaries of the teachers of the country.

But it is also the duty of the people to see that adequate means for the preparation of teachers be made available on such terms as will induce competent young men and women to engage in teaching. And this is not merely a local problem nor a state problem; it is a national problem as well. It is undoubtedly one of the principal duties of our schools to put into the minds and hearts of the youth of our land the principles of American liberty and justice and to teach them the blessings and the responsibility of American citizenship. Indifference as to the want of school privileges or as to the character of the schools and their teachers will inevitably result in the deterioration of our citizenship and endanger the life of the Nation. It is to aid and encourage the states in the work of preparing competent teachers for all the schools within their borders, both public and private, that this provision is inserted in the bill.

Objections

It is urged that this bill provides for an undue extension of the powers of the general government; that education is properly a state function and should not be invaded by the Nation. In reply to this objection it may be said that the legislation proposed does not usurp the powers of the states in their control of education. On the contrary, the control and management of the schools by state and local authorities is most carefully preserved, and very definite and positive provision is made against any interference on the part of the Federal Government. It cannot be too strongly stated that this bill is to aid and encourage, and not to control. The bill instead of granting power to the Federal Government to control education within the states in the strongest possible provisions guards against it.

The Secretary of Education is denied the right to establish standards or to exercise any power over the conduct of the schools. The only standards or conditions which must be met by the states in order to receive the benefits provided are clearly stated in the bill. All details with respect to courses of study, plans, and methods are left entirely to the states.

It cannot be said that national aid for education is a new proposition. As a matter of historic fact, the policy of making grants by the National Government for the education of the people antedates the adoption of the Constitution. The land act of 1785 provided for the survey of the Northwest Territory and set aside therein lot No. 16 in every township for "the maintenance of public schools within said township." The ordinance of 1787 declared that "schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged." In 1826 the section-grant provision was applied to the Louisiana purchase. In 1848, in the Oregon Territory land act, sections 16 and 36 were set aside for the public schools. Nor were grants of land only made by the general government. In 1818 the act admitting Illinois set aside the "5 per cent" funds for education. The surplus distributions were used largely for that purpose. In 1863 the Morrill Act providing for the establishment of the "land-grant colleges" in each state was signed by President Lincoln. This was strengthened by the Hatch Act in 1887. The second Morrill Act, passed in 1890, gave $25,000 a year to each land-grant college. This was increased first to $30,000 and then to $80,000 a year in cash from the national treasury. The Smith-Lever Act of 1914 gave further increases for extension work and farmers' institutes. The Smith-Hughes Act of 1917, providing for assistance to the states for the promotion of vocational education, gives a total maximum appropriation from the National Government annually of $7,200,000 for that purpose.

It is evident that the policy was early adopted and has been since maintained that the National Government shall, when national as well as state interests are involved, aid the states in the education of its citizens.

The additional demand which will be made upon the treasury is urged as an objection. In the first place, it should be observed that the bill does not appropriate but merely authorizes appropriations. It establishes a limit rather than creates a burden. It is within the discretion of Congress to appropriate the whole or any part within that limit in any year. Besides, it is not at

all probable that the entire amount provided will ever be called for. To absorb the entire amount all the states would have to qualify under all the five separate provisions every year. It is not likely that this will ever occur. Some states will qualify for aid in the removal of illiteracy. Others will not need it. Some will qualify for the Americanization of immigrants. Others will not do so. And this is the case with each of the five provisions. The Federal Government will respond only when the state shall deem its own need in that particular matter of sufficient importance to make at least an equal appropriation.

When Congress is to consider to which of the various demands for appropriations it will respond, it should make selection of those which are of greatest importance and omit those which are least justifiable. There is nothing of more importance in our scheme of government than the education of the people. Whatever else may be left out, education cannot safely be excluded. If there is any one thing that justifies a tax in the judgment of American citizens, it is that which strengthens and supports our public schools. There are many millions now appropriated which have much less justification than the appropriations called for under the terms of this bill.

If education should be given the recognition which its importance requires, if illiteracy is a national peril, if ignorance of our language and institutions is a source of danger, if through the equalization of educational opportunities there should be guaranteed to every child in the land at least a common-school education, if the conservation of the physical well-being of the youth of our land is imperative from the standpoint of national welfare, if there should be provided for every boy and girl in America a competent, well-qualified teacher in order that there may be developed throughout our Nation an intelligent and enlightened citizenship, then it can be fairly said that this legislation is justified.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION: ITS JUSTIFICATION, DEGREE AND METHOD[1]

The Cabinet was not created by the Constitution. It is an institution of government created solely by legislative enactment.

[1] By Congressman Horace M. Towner. University of Illinois Bulletin. Vol. 19. No. 23. p. 77-88. February 6, 1922.

New executive departments are created and new members of the Cabinet added whenever Congress considers it wise that such action should be taken. The first three of the ten now in existence were established in Washington's administration, the last one was created in 1913.

Departments are not created nor members of the Cabinet appointed to control the subjects assigned them. If the general government has the Constitutional power to control the subject, such measure of control may be given the secretary as Congress deems advisable. For example, the general government is given control of military affairs and the Secretary of War is granted certain powers of control. The general government is given control of postal affairs, and the Postmaster General is given large powers over such matters. The Constitution gives no power to the general government to control agriculture or labor. Hence, the Secretary of Agriculture is charged with the duty of "promoting agriculture." He is not given power to control agriculture. The Secretary of Labor is charged with the duty of "fostering, promoting, and developing the welfare of the wage-earners of the United States." He is given no power in any manner to control labor. In like manner, if a Department of Education is created, its secretary will be given no power to control education, but he may be charged with the duty of conducting studies and investigation in the field of education, he may call educational conferences, and encourage and aid the states in their educational work without exercising any measure of control.

The justification for creating a Department of Education lies primarily in the fact that education is of supreme importance under our system of government, and should receive the recognition its importance merits. It has been a source of wonder to foreign observers of our institutions that the United States has so far failed to give education such recognition. It is almost alone among the nations in that respect. As reported by the Bureau of Efficiency, the National Government expended over $65,000,000 during the year 1920 for educational purposes. The educational activities thus carried on are scattered among the numerous bureaus, divisions, and commissions without any coordination and with numerous duplications of work. The Bureau of Education occupying a subordinate place in the Department of the Interior, and supported by only a small appropriation, has no control or even knowledge of these various activities. It is apparent that in order to secure efficiency and economy in the

work already assumed of this character a directing and coordinating head is required.

A Department is needed to coordinate and integrate the scattered educational forces among the states. It is proposed to create and organize a National Council of Education to consult and advise with the Secretary of Education on subjects relating to the promotion and development of education throughout the nation. This council is to consist of the chief educational authority of each state; twenty-five educators, representing different interests in education, and twenty-five eminent persons, not educators, interested in education from the standpoint of the public. Annual conferences are to be called, at which the entire scope of the educational interests of the nation will be considered.

It is manifest that in order to carry on such work a Secretary of Education is required. Both in the councils of the Cabinet and in leadership and influence with the educational forces throughout the land, such an educational head is necessary to dignify and unify the educational work of the nation. This does not imply nor is it desired if it were possible to take from the states the control of their educational systems, nor does it mean the adoption of a national system of education. It is only to aid and encourage the states to greater educational endeavor, and by mutual conference and discussion to bring to the states most backward the stimulus that will raise their standards to the level of the more forward and advanced.

It is believed that the creation of a Department of Education, with its chief a secretary in the President's Cabinet, will express for the first time in our history the nation's real interest in education; that it will promote by research, investigation, and reports the practical operation of our public school system throughout the United States; that it will by leadership and service stir the states and the people to a greater interest in educational work and to a more comprehensive knowledge of educational needs, and that it will mark the commencement of a new era of educational progress throughout the whole country.

It is further proposed that provision shall be made to authorize appropriations from the national treasury to encourage the states in the promotion and support of education. In order to do this effectively certain specific educational needs are considered as being the most important and pressing. Thus appropriations are to be authorized to encourage the states for the

removal of illiteracy, for the Americanization of immigrants, for the preparation of teachers, to promote physical education, and to equalize educational opportunities. It is believed that this selection of objects covers in large measure the most pressing educational needs in which there is an immediate national interest. A state may accept the provisions of any one or more of the respective apportionments by meeting the prescribed requirements and by providing for the expenditure from state or local funds of a sum at least equally as large as the national grant for the particular apportionment authorized.

It is provided that these grants from the national treasury are not dependent upon executive discretion or favor, but are compulsory when the states meet the conditions specifically stated in the act.

These requirements are minimum requirements, and there can be no reasonable dissent as to their necessity and fairness. The National Government cannot make a grant without stating the purpose for which the grant is made, and in making a contingent grant it must state specifically the conditions necessary to be met in order to secure the grant. On the other hand, the state is entitled to know just what the requirements necessary to receive its part of the apportionment are, so that it can be assured that if it meets those requirements, and those only, it will not have to appeal for executive favor in order to receive its grant, and will not be required to surrender control of its educational system to a centralized authority.

It is said that the legislation is unnecessary. This objection is urged both against the creation of a Department of Education, and against the proposal to aid the states by subventions from the national treasury. There is always reluctance about creating a new department. Originally there were but three, State, Treasury, and War. An advisory attorney was selected, and afterward he became a member of the Cabinet. Then came at intervals, Navy, Post Office, Interior, Agriculture, Commerce and Labor, and then separately, Labor. Now we have ten departments, and our Cabinet is one of the smallest among the nations. The purpose of the creation of all these executive departments was to give recognition to and secure a more effective realization of our primary and essential national interests. Because the National Government was not given control of education, and because the states have exercised that power does not disparage the fact

that education has been throughout our history a primary, almost a paramount interest of the Nation. In 1785 the National Government made grants of its public lands for the "maintenance of public schools." The Ordinance of 1787 creating the Northwest Territory provided that "Schools and the means of education shall be forever encouraged." From that time down to the present the National Government has recognized education as an important interest of the Nation, and has aided it with grants both of land and money. If it has been and is a primary interest of the Nation, why should not full recognition be given it by the National Government? It certainly is of equal importance with Commerce, or Agriculture, or Labor.

It is asserted by some objectors that merely to create a Department of Education and select a secretary will transfer the control of the schools from the states to the Nation; that in some mysterious manner there will thus be created an autocracy that will reach out and absorb all the educational activities of the Nation; that for some undisclosed and malevolent purpose a conspiracy has been formed of the educators of the country to subvert the Constitution and destroy the liberties of the people. It is unnecessary to say in this presence that there is no effort being made anywhere or by anybody to transfer the control of the schools from the states to the Nation. On the contrary, in most explicit terms the secretary is forbidden to exercise any control over the schools within the states, and that power is expressly reserved to the states.

The objection is also urged that merely to grant appropriations from the national treasury contingent upon conditions, in and of itself transfers control from the states to the Nation; that the states in order to secure the funds from the National Government will surrender their Constitutional rights; in short, that the Nation offers to buy from the states the control of the schools and assume the power of directing and managing the education of the people.

This objection, strange as it may appear, is the argument most strongly urged by the opponents of the legislation for National aid. It must appear indeed remarkable that such a purpose could have actuated the educators of the country in the formation of their bill. It has not generally been supposed that the school men of the Nation were engaged in a conspiracy to subvert the Constitution and secure control of the government. It

must appear to every reasonable man that there is no desire nor can there be any purpose on the part of the representatives of the government to take over the control of the schools. It must also be apparent that the people of the states are not so stupid and submissive as to sell their right to control the education of their children for a money bribe.

The legislation is advocated because conditions are urgent and demand action, and because the states are in some cases unable and in others unwilling to meet the emergency without help It is to stimulate the states to greater activity in the education of their own people; it is to aid them in reducing the burden and danger because of the ignorance of their people that this legislation is urged. The government has an equal interest with the states in the character of its citizens. The government has no citizens nor interests within its territory outside the states. Their people are its people, and their citizens are its citizens. If the people of the states are ignorant, so are the people of the Nation. If the peace, prosperity, and security of the states must depend upon the intelligence of its citizens, so is it with the Nation. With this community of interest there is a common obligation. So it is proposed to aid the states by granting them funds from the national treasury, and in effect to say to the states: "The National Government will help you to remove this burden and danger from your people, because your people are my people, and your interests are my interests." In effect, also, the government declares to the states by this proposed legislation: "This aid is granted you upon the condition that you use it only for the purpose stated in the grant, and that you use it in your own way without dictation or control by the government."

It may be again stated that all the conditions upon which aid is granted are statutory, and are specifically stated in the act. These requirements may be changed by Congress, but they cannot be changed by the secretary or any other executive officer. No additional requirements can be added, and no autocratic, bureaucratic, or centralized control imposed.

It should be further stated that before any state can receive the benefits of the act such state must by legislative enactment accept its provisions. So that there must be an agreement of the representatives of the people of the Nation with the representatives of the people of the state before the legislation can become effective. Under such circumstances it is not probable, it is not

possible that the state will surrender its rights, or that the Nation will transcend its powers.

Attention is called to the fact that by the provisions of the bill the administration, the application, and distribution of the funds within the state are exclusively committed to the state authorities. I think I am justified in saying that in no other legislation of this character ever enacted have the rights of the states been so carefully guarded. Let me call your attention to this provision of the bill, found in Section 13, 1-3:

PROVIDED, That courses of study, plans and methods for carrying out the purposes of this act within a state, shall be determined by the state and local educational authorities of said state, and this act shall not be construed to require uniformity of courses of study, plans, and methods in the several states in order to secure the benefits herein provided: AND PROVIDED FURTHER, That all the educational facilities encouraged by the provisions of this act and accepted by a state shall be organized, supervised, and administered exclusively by the legally constituted state and local educational authorities of said state, and the Secretary of education shall exercise no authority in relation thereto except Education shall exercise no authority in relation thereto except state shall be used for the purposes for which they are appropriated by Congress.

If any stronger or more explicit statement can be made saving to the states their right to control their own schools in their own way and prohibiting any interference on the part of the general government, the friends of the measure would be glad to accept it.

It is said that contributions from the national treasury are unnecessary, for the states will meet the emergency and provide the necessary means. If that were true, the objection would be good. But is it true?

Take illiteracy, as an example, and consider conditions. The census of 1910 showed that in the United States there were 5,500,000 over ten years of age who could not read or write any language. In addition there were 3,500,00 who could not speak, or read, or write English. This placed us below the standard of most of the civilized nations of the world. But that was not the worst. The examination of the draft registrants for service in the late war showed that of the men called between the ages of twenty-one and thirty-one, nearly 25 per cent could not read a newspaper, could not write a letter home, and could not read the posted orders about the camps.

The Nation's defense is thus doubly impaired; first, because one-fourth of the sons of America called to the colors are incapacitated for efficient service because of their ignorance; and, second, because in a free country its safety is jeopardized when a determining portion of its voters cannot read the ballots they cast and can only vote as they are told.

Consider the economic loss which Secretary Lane estimates as at least $825,000,000 each year. The Director of the Bureau of Mines states that of the 1,000,000 men engaged in mining in the United States 620,000 are foreigners, and that of these 460,000 cannot speak English. He states that the removal of illiteracy among the miners would save annually 1,000 lives and 150,000 injuries. Investigation has shown that one-half the industrial accidents are the result of ignorance, because the workers cannot read the danger warnings or understand the orders given.

It has been said that illiteracy is a southern problem. The facts do not warrant that conclusion. Georgia has 389,000 illiterates, but New York has 406,000. Alabama has 352,000, while Pennsylvania has 354,000. Louisiana has 352,000, Mississippi 290,000, and Texas 282,000; but Illinois has 168,000, Ohio, 124,000, and even Massachusetts has 141,000.

It is thought that illiteracy is a race problem. But it is much more than that. There are over 1,000,000 more white illiterates in the United States than illiterate negroes.

Is not this clearly a national problem? If the Nation's safety is imperilled, if the lives of its own citizens are being lost, and if the states are not able or not willing without help to remove this reproach and danger, is not national aid justified and imperative?

Consider the condition of our immigrant population. We now have over 15,000,000 foreign-born people in the United States. More than 5,000,000 cannot speak, read, or write English. More than 2,000,000 cannot read or write any language. Unfortunately these foreigners often group themselves into alien settlements or colonies, where our language is not spoken, where our journals are not read, and where the whole environment is alien and un-American. These masses of alien ignorance constitute a rich soil for sowing the seeds of unrest and revolt. Revolutionary agitators who come to this country to advocate the destruction of our government find here their opportunity.

To make the immigrant understand America is the only way to make him love America. He cannot love a country he does not understand. Education is the first requisite of Americanization. Education, first in our language, and then in the nature of our institutions is the best defense against the bolshevik and the anarchist.

This demand is not being met. When great states like Massachusetts and New York and Ohio have actually increased both their percentage and total of illiteracy within the decade from 1900 to 1910 because of their failure to educate their foreign-born, we realize that even these enlightened commonwealths need stimulation and aid.

Perhaps no disclosure of the draft examinations carries more reproach to our intelligence than the fact that out of about two thousand four hundred young men examined for service seven hundred thousand, or nearly one-third, were found disqualified because of physical disability. Ninety per cent of these disabilities could have been prevented by a knowledge of the simplest rules of hygiene and health. It was ignorance, gross ignorance, that in the vast majority of cases was the cause of their incompetence.

There is but one adequate remedy for this disgraceful and distressing condition,—to put into all our schools a system of physical education. Unfortunately, this has not been done. The additional cost deprives thousands of schools and tens of thousands of children of this essential element of education. Here again is the stimulation and help of the Nation needed to remedy the existing unfortunate conditions.

That gross inequalities in educational opportunities exist within and among the states is well known. In the south almost one-half of the negro children never see the inside of a school room. In the north there is hardly a city that has adequate facilities for all its children. In some rural communities and factory districts the value of the property is so small that local taxation cannot support the schools. On an average the country boy has two months less school than the city boy.

Unfortunately, it is found that where the educational needs are greatest the schools are most inadequate. All over our land the poorest schools are in the poorest communities—just where the best schools are most needed. To equalize educational opportunities is a task the Nation is especially qualified to undertake. To encourage and aid the backward states to bring their deficiencies up to a reasonable measure of efficiency and service

is apparently a national duty. By such stimulation and cooperation we may be able to give every child in America the advantage of at least a common school education.

The most pressing educational problem confronting the people of the United States at the present time is to obtain competent teachers for our schools. Thousands of schools have been closed because teachers of any kind could not be secured. Tens of thousands of schools are now being taught by incompetent teachers. Three hundred thousand are teaching who have no professional training whatever.

An equally imperative duty is that of providing means for the better preparation of teachers. We need about seven hundred thousand teachers to teach our schools, and this requires about one hundred and twenty thousand new teachers each year to keep the quota full. Our schools and colleges preparing for teaching are turning out but twenty-four thousand each year. Nearly one hundred thousand must enter the profession each year inadequately prepared. This condition is alarming, and must be remedied. In some way we must bring the states and the people to a realization of this danger. Unless conditions can be bettered we shall have in the present decade a larger proportion of near-illiterates than was disclosed by the war registration. Indifference as to the character of our schools and their teachers will inevitably lead to a deterioration of our citizenship. We must see to it that every school in the land is taught by a competent teacher. Nothing less than that is safe for either state or Nation.

If illiteracy is a national peril, if ignorance of our language and institutions is a source of danger, if unjustifiable inequalities exist in educational opportunities in our land, if our young men called to the service of their country are incapacitated because of ignorance of the ordinary rules of health, if schools are being closed for want of teachers, and almost one-half are being taught by incompetent teachers, then it can fairly be claimed that national aid for education is justified and necessary.

It is urged as an objection that it is unjust to call upon the stronger states to aid the weaker to educate their children; that the money derived from general taxation which would fall heaviest on the richer states should not be used to help the poorer states; that each state should bear the burden and responsibility of educating its own people.

This objection was urged from the beginning against the whole system of public schools. It was argued that parents should have the burden of educating their own children and that taxation to support common schools was unconstitutional and unjust. It was said the rich man was under no obligation to help educate the children of the poor. It was especially urged that those having no children to educate must not be taxed to help educate the children of others. It was still more strenuously insisted that it was especially iniquitous to tax the property of a bachelor to carry on schools for others' children.

But all those objections were disregarded, and now no one claims that it is unjust to tax the rich man to educate the poor man's children, and the bachelor must pay his taxes to support the schools, whether he wants to or not. It is recognized that the welfare of a community or state depends upon the character of its citizens; that the city or state is concerned for its own safety and peace in the intelligence of all its citizens, and that each must contribute his share for the common good.

So with the Nation. We have seen how its safety may be jeopardized because of the illiteracy and physical incapacity of so many of its young men. We have seen how in a free government its security and prosperity depend on the intelligence of its entire electorate. Neither illiterates nor alien malcontents can be confined to any one state. And so it is a national problem as well as a state and local problem. Manifestly, it needs the cooperation of all these to find and supply the remedy.

The cost of the government is urged as an objection to the legislation. To place this additional burden on the government at this time of extraordinary expenditures would be unwise, it is said. Our people already groaning under the weight of federal taxes will not approve this addition to the load, it is argued. Granting the full weight of this objection, it must be admitted that the Nation must make choice as to its expenditures. Wise action depends on selecting those objects for national appropriations which are most needed and most important. There is nothing in our scheme of government more important than the education of the people. Whatever else may be left out, education cannot safely be excluded. And this may be said to the credit of our people, the one thing that justifies a tax in their judgment is that which strengthens and supports our public schools. There are many millions annually appropriated which

in their opinion have much less justification than the appropriations authorized by this bill. We might cut off a hundred million from either the army or the navy bills with less danger and more profit than to omit this appropriation. We gave seventy-five millions the other day to the states for good roads. Are good roads of more importance than good schools? We are still spending millions to remove rocks from our harbors and snags from our rivers; to remove hog-cholera in Iowa, and cattle-ticks in Texas; to remove boll-weevil in Alabama, and wheat-rust in North Dakota,—are we justified in refusing to spend anything to remove illiteracy from our own American citizens? It is not that the things mentioned are not worthy of consideration, but certainly they are not more worthy of consideration than is the education of our children. Those things are after all but economic ills, while ignorance imperils the safety and endangers the perpetuity of the Nation itself.

There are some outstanding facts regarding the relations of the Nation and the states toward education which it is wise to recognize. There has never been proposed in Congress any legislation which even suggested that the Nation should take from the states the control of education. No one has ever advocated it, no one now proposes it, no one in or out of Congress desires it. The proposition has no support anywhere by anyone.

There is no legal authority for such legislation if anyone did propose it. If a bill carrying such a proposal were introduced, it would immediately be recognized as without Constitutional warrant, and would never even reach the calendar of either Senate or House.

To claim that anyone, sponsor or supporter of the pending educational bill, desires or expects national control of education to follow the enactment of the legislation under consideration is without the slightest sanction. To state that the emphatic and and repeated negations expressed in the strongest language that can be used which are incorporated in the very terms of the proposed law mean nothing and will not be effective, is to say that no law can be made effective by its terms.

But while Congress has no desire nor purpose nor Constitutional power to take from the states the control of education, the general government has the right to aid and encourage the states in the eduaction of their and its citizens, and this right it has exercised repeatedly from the beginning of our history to the

passage of the last Appropriation Act. It granted sections of the public lands to the states for schools. It granted townships of land for the creation and support of universities. Lands were given as long as they lasted, and then money was given. Congress gives annually over $2,500,000 from the national treasury for the "support and further endowment of colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts." Every year we give tens of millions of dollars from the national treasury in support of almost every form of education. Why is it that these grants are not opposed? Why is it that where education is so much needed, at the very bottom of our political and social structure, where it enters into the very texture of the fabric of our American citizenship—in form about which there is no controversy and in substance the acknowledged essential—why is it that when it is proposed to strengthen our common school system the proposition is condemned and opposed?

VIEWS OF PROFESSORS SPAULDING AND ROSS

It is evident that the development of this, or of any other plan of education, national in scope and adapted to national needs, demands the establishment of a Department of Education in the National Government, a department that shall be on a par with other state departments, having a secretary at its head, who is a member of the President's Cabinet. Let no one suppose that the establishment of such a Department of Education would mark an innovation. On the contrary, the present lack of such a department in the American government places it almost in a class by itself in this respect. In two score governments, all over the world, there is found a Department, or Ministry, of Education, or Public Instruction. America is distinguished as the one important nation of the world that fails to recognize education as one of the half dozen or half score great national fundamental interests and responsibilities. This is a startling fact; but the all-sufficient reason for adequate governmental recognition of public education in America is the simple reason that only through such recognition can there be assured to all the American people adequate preparation for the great tasks that are before them; that only through such recognition of education can

the American nation qualify itself to discharge the unprecedented responsibilities that should be welcome, that will be inevitable.—*Professor Frank E. Spaulding. Atlantic Monthly.* 125: 538. *April,* 1920.

Recognizing the tragic handicap of the unlettered man in a society which more and more takes intelligence for granted, educational leaders deplore the great disparity in school opportunities. In American Commonwealths, for example, the school "year" varies from four months to ten months. In one state four-fifths of the teachers have only an elementary education, while in certain other states all are at least normal school or high school graduates. In 1916 the average pay of teachers in California was nearly thrice that of Mississippi. In the same year the state at the head of the list spent nine times as much on the education of its average child as did the state at the foot of the list. Apparently Scandinavia and the Balkans, Scotland and Chile, stand scarcely farther apart in respect to educational opportunities than do certain states of the American Union. Such inequalities may not be trusted to disappear of themselves. Ignorance is self-perpetuating. Poor schools may become endemic in a region. Nevertheless, the intelligent communities must submit to be governed in part by the representatives of the dark-minded districts. No wonder they resort to state compulsion or state financial aid to level up educational opportunities within the state and advocate federal compulsion or federal financial aid to level up within the nation. Nor is this tendency to nationalize education peculiarly American; it is, in fact, world wide. All progressive peoples are coming to feel that the child's schooling is too much a social concern to be left entirely to the direction of the parents, or even of the local community.—*Professor Edward A. Ross. Principles of Sociology. p.* 602-3.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST THE BILL[1]

1. The chief argument against the establishment of a Department of Education is based on the fear that the Federal Government would dominate education throughout the country. President Hadley of Yale views the bill "as a long step in the Prus-

[1] By Dr. Robert H. Mahoney. The Federal Government and Education. p. 48-55.

sianizing of American education," and regards the introduction of another cabinet minister "as calculated to weaken rather than strengthen the influence of the Cabinet." [1] He insists, moreover, that "the concentration of educational supervision in a national capital has always worked badly, and there is no reason to suppose that the United States would prove an exception to this general rule. French education when controlled from Paris has tended to ossify, and only as they have given independence to different parts of the system has there been progress made. All the pieces of progress of the last century were done in opposition to the national incubus of a centralized bureau." [2] Likewise Capen believes that under the bill the federal government would gradually and inevitably come to exercise a very large measure of dictation and control, and that federal control of local educational activities secured and perpetuated by the tacit threat of withholding federal grants would be intolerable.[3]

While the bill explicitly states that federal control of education in the states is not to prevail under the act, Dean Burris holds that it is there in spite of all efforts to disguise it, and that no such national program for education as that contemplated in the bill could be carried out without a large measure of federal control both direct and indirect. If this control is vested in a Cabinet officer, it will be inevitably exposed to partisan influences. Besides, the presence of a Secretary of Education in the Cabinet is neither imperative nor desirable. For the proposed Department of Education a Federal Board of Education would be preferable. Under such a board, he maintains, continuity in the development of well thought out policies would be assured, and the dangers arising from patronage in the appointment of assistants would be prevented.[4]

Federal control over education is at once unconstitutional and undesirable, adds Burris; and in the words of former Senator Root it "calls for the exercise of power by the Federal Government which has not been committed to that government by the people of the United States in their Constitution, but has been reserved to the several states. It seems equally clear that no such power ought to be committed to the government, because it would

[1] The Educational Record. Vol. 1. No. 3. p. 105.

[2] Ibid.

[3] The Educational Review. November, 1920. p. 287.

[4] Burris, W. P. Address, A Federal Department of Education. Department of Superintendents, National Education Association, February 26, 1920.

be absolutely inconsistent with one of the two primary purposes of our system of government, that is to say, preservation of the right of local self-government in the states, at the same time with the maintenance of national power."[1] According to Professor Guthrie of Columbia, the provisions of the bill would "inevitably involve an attempt at interference in the local affairs of the states, and the policy of so-called federalization of education once established would lead to an agitation and demand for a constitutional amendment to vest adequate power of centralized supervision and control in Congress."[2] In this way, believes Burris, the influence now working for the beginning of a program of centralization would ultimately destroy the "very substance of Americanism, which is individualism, self-reliance, initiative, and responsibility."[3]

2. It is pointed out by Capen that the bill fails to coordinate the present educational activities of the Federal Government; it lays no satisfactory foundations since it "dodges the whole question of the coordination and simplification of the government's present educational activities. . . It is easily possible to determine on the basis of some defensible principle which existing government offices belong in a department with functions such as those of the proposed Department of Education. In failing to indicate which these are, the framers and sponsors of the bill have not faced the primary obligation of their task."[4] It is especially noted that the bill fails to include the Federal Board for Vocational Education under the Department of Education. It is conceded by most educators that vocational education should be related organically to the rest of the government's educational work; the attempt to separate it from general education in states and cities has been disastrous.[5] Granting, however, that the Federal Board is brought under the department as authorized by Section 3 of the act, an anomalous situation would ensue, because the Smith-Hughes Act admits supervision of education within the states, while the Towner-Sterling Bill denies such supervision.[6]

[1] Quoted. Ibid.
[2] Bulletin. The Catholic Educational Association. Vol. XVI. No. 4. 1920.
[3] Op. cit.
[4] The Educational Review, November, 1920. p. 286-7.
[5] Ibid. p. 291.
[6] Ibid. p. 292

In the two-fold character of the measure, moreover, there is believed to exist a misalliance; it is held that the Department of Education and the relief measure are two different and in some respects conflicting propositions; and "to promote the subsidy feature the unification of the government's educational activities was sacrificed." [1]

3. While the friends of the bill believe that the measure would not involve partisan politics in the appointment of a Secretary of Education, the opponents of the bill are not so optimistic.

In the recent volume, The Nation and the Schools, by Keith and Bagley, we read: "It is said that a President would probably appoint as Secretary of Education a member of his own political party. . . This assertion is not true with respect to those who have served as Commissioners of Education. . . It is reasonable to assume that the President would honestly desire to find the most capable man for the Secretaryship of Education and that he would make every possible effort to find such a man without making previous partisan service a prerequisite for appointment. With this reasonable assurance, the party affiliation of the person appointed becomes insignificant." [2]

The high hopes expressed in the lines just quoted were given a severe jolt by the action of President Harding in removing United States Commissioner Claxton. To the friends of education everywhere, this action was especially unwelcome. Speaking editorially in the June, 1921, issue of the Journal of the National Education Association, Bagley complained: "It is most unfortunate that a change should be made at this time when the need for recognized national leadership in education is imperative. It is certain to be construed as having been determined by political motives and in total disregard of the growing demand for the elevation of the Nation's chief educational office." Similarly, the Educational Review in its issue of September, 1921, commented that Commissioner Claxton's successor "would probably never have been selected by a body of experts or of impartial lay citizens, and the removal of Dr. Claxton seems to have been somewhat impelled by political motives, which should everywhere be eliminated from education."

This incident has convinced many of the opponents of the Sterling-Towner Bill that unless the measure is defeated, we

[1] Ibid. p. 291.

[2] p. 306.

shall witness the inauguration at Washington of a vast politico-educational machine, and that instead of attaining higher dignity in the councils of the Nation, education may inherit the taint of sordid partisan politics.

4. The principle of federal subsidy as provided in the bill likewise meets with strong disapproval. Capen regards it as an accidental discovery rather than the result of careful investigation.[1] The principle of federal subsidy is still on trial and its universal validity is by no means proved; again, it appears "not to differentiate between federal stimulation of new educational movements and federal support of the general educational enterprise of the states."[2] Basing his observations upon the operation of previous laws involving the principle of federal subventions, Mann contends that the distribution of $100,000,000 on the fifty-fifty principle would be a fatal blunder for educational progress in the country.[3] It is also emphasized that the federal education office should exercise its leadership by means of ideas, and that when adequately equipped to investigate educational conditions, to point out defects and recommend improvements, it would accomplish everything that is sought by large federal appropriations.[4] It is pointed out that the result would be more wholesome were the state to undertake measures for their own improvement rather than have improvement thrust upon them; the dollar for dollar appropriations are in principle not far removed from bribery.[5]

Judd observes that "the popular mind seems prone to accept the assumption that the Federal Government can with propriety undertake everything and anything. The most insidious form of this popular superstition is the widespread belief that the Federal Government has unlimited financial resources upon which it is entirely legitimate to draw for any worthy purpose which is otherwise likely to become insolvent."[6] There are no grounds

[1] Ibid. p. 289.

[2] The Educational Record. Vol. I. No. 1. p. 13.

[3] The Educational Review. November, 1920. p. 313.

[4] Pamphlet. American Council on Education. "Arguments Submitted, etc." p. 6.

[5] Ibid.

[6] The Educational Record. Vol. 1. No. 3.

NOTE.—In an address delivered at the installation of David Kinley as President of the University of Illinois, December 1, 1921, President W. O. Thompson of Ohio State University declared that if the view prevails that education is a national issue, we may expect that "national revenues will be increasingly used and that the problems of the relations between national and state agencies will increase in importance."

for the assumption that financial support as provided in the Sterling-Towner Bill is the duty of the Federal Government or that it will operate to raise educational standards; it is believed, moreover, that there is more danger than benefit in federal appropriations without federal supervision.[1]

While many of the arguments advanced against the subsidy principle might be regarded as speculative merely, the lessons of experience are available, and point clearly to the weakness of federal subsidy. The Federal Constitution of Switzerland, for example, includes an amendment authorizing the government to grant subventions to schools in the cantons. In Switzerland, this policy has not been generally approved; upon consultation with leading Swiss authorities, Bryce found that it was regarded as a fault in the Swiss system. Says Bryce:

> The plan of granting subventions from the national treasury to the cantons is alleged to be wasteful, injurious to the cantons in impairing self-helpfulness, and liable to be perverted for political purposes. The dominant party can, it is said, strengthen itself by these gifts, and bring a small canton too much under federal influence. Against this it is argued that the power of withholding a subvention is an engine for securing the enforcement of federal law by a canton disposed to be insubordinate. No great mischief has resulted so far, but the practice has its risks. Local subsidies have been lavishly bestowed, and misused for political ends, in the United States and in Canada.[2]

Again, in the experience of our own country, the subsidy principle has shown its weakness. We have at present laws authorizing federal cooperation with the states in the building of roads. To guard against abuses arising from this policy, President Harding in his message of April 12, 1921, insisted that "large federal outlay demands a federal program of expenditure. . . The laws governing federal aid should be amended and strengthened. The federal agency of administration should be elevated to the importance and vested with the authority comparable to the work before it. And Congress ought to prescribe conditions to federal appropriations which will justify the federal outlay."

Federal aid for road-building operations is undoubtedly advisable and in accord with the Constitution; and to insure that

[1] Ibid.

[2] Bryce, James. Modern Democracies. New York. 1921. Vol. I. p. 367.

the federal apportionments are wisely expended, a policy of federal control is necessary. The extension of such control over education, however, would be highly detrimental to the best interests of the country, and would be clearly unconstitutional.

Experience to date, therefore, both at home and abroad, can scarcely be said to favor further extension of the subsidy principle in education.

Finally, objection to the $100,000,000 appropriation is made on economic grounds. Blakely holds that common honesty justifies opposition to it on the ground of its excessive cost at a time when the country is suffering from serious financial burdens resulting from the war.[1] Former President Hadley of Yale objects on kindred grounds, believing that the present is a singularly inopportune time for increased national expense at Washington, and that the adverse effect of the bill economically would greatly outweigh any possible good that might be derived.[2] It has been urged also that the determination of the purpose for which the appropriation should be spent is too far removed from the people who are taxed for the expenditure.[3]

5. Another argument which has been advanced by the opponents of the Sterling-Towner Bill is that it is a direct attack upon the principle of local self-government; it imperils state sovereignty and may give rise to paternalism and bureaucracy. It is stated that "bureaucratic control is the almost inevitable consequence of large federal subsidies devoted to any kind of undertaking," and that "however carefully the appropriating act may be drawn to preserve local autonomy and prevent undue federal influence there is finally in the hands of the federal office administering the subsidies great coercive power."[4] Addressing the United States Senate May 22, 1920, Senator King declared that there is "a propaganda nation wide, to further weaken the states by transferring to the Federal Government the duty and responsibility resting upon the states of educating all within their borders. It is unquestionably the attribute of a sovereign state to provide the educational system for its inhabitants. It is an invasion of

[1] Blakely, P. L. Pamphlet. The Case Against the Smith-Towner Bill. New York. 1920.

[2] The Educational Record. Vol. I. No. 3.

[3] Pamphlet. American Council on Education. "Arguments Submitted, etc." p. 6.

[4] Ibid. p. 5.

the rights of the states to have some other government superimpose its educational system upon the people therein or control in any manner the action of such state in relation to the subject."[1] Likewise, Senator Thomas in addressing the Senate said that he was "profoundly convinced that one of the things that the states reserved to themselves and which is essential to their integrity and to the integrity of the cause of local self-government is their continued retention of jurisdiction over the education of the people within their borders."[2] Hence it is argued that accordingly as the tendency to give up home rule in education is realized in the various communities and states, local interest in education will correspondingly wane.

Impressed therefore with the possible effect of the bill upon local control, educational authorities within many of the states have been studying the measure in its bearing upon their respective states. In a report to Governor Alfred E. Smith of New York State, July 19, 1919, submitted by Dr. Augustus S. Downing, the Assistant Commissioner of Education, after conference with President John H. Finley of the University of the State of New York, it is concluded among other things (1) that the bill would add a serious burden of taxation to the inhabitants of the state without just reason; (2) that the state of New York has taken the lead in the fields encouraged by the bill, and that so far as the state of New York is concerned, its provisions are not needed; (3) that judging from the experience of the state of New York which expends approximately $80,000,000 annually for the support of public education (which sum represents an increase of 33⅓ per cent within recent years) that the $100,000,000 for the entire country provided in the bill would prove only a pittance of the amount that would be actually required and demanded by the states that would take advantage of the paternalism thus offered them; (4) that the introduction of the bill at this time is inopportune and its passage is clearly not desirable.

In a Memorandum subjoined to Dr. Downing's report, the following facts are pointed out:

> In 1918 New York paid 37 per cent of the Income Tax of the County. In 1917 New York paid 25 per cent of the Expenditures of Government. Upon the later basis New York Citizens would pay for centralized education at least $25,000,000. Under the most liberal calculation, New York would receive under the proposed legislation less than $10,000,000.

[1] Congressional Record. May 22, 1920.
[2] Ibid. July 28, 1919.

According to the memorandum, the total educational appropriation of the state of New York for 1919 is $17,430,000 and under the proposed bill, *"the additional moneys to New York would be surplusage, at the very disproportionate share in the expense of obtaining it."* It further states that under the terms of the measure South Carolina would pay $228,000 and benefit to the extent of $1,755,000; Mississippi would pay $143,000 and benefit to the extent of $2,115,000. The following twelve states, Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, New Mexico, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia would collectively pay $7,237,000 and benefit to the extent of $25,424,000.

It is maintained, therefore, that there is no demand for federal legislation from the states that have been progressive. The demand originates from the states that have failed in compulsory education, or that seek to obtain "pork" at the expense of the richer states. The memorandum concludes that "the local communities of New York will in the end pay the bill and the work will not be done as well as if done by those concerned."

OVER-ORGANIZATION OF EDUCATION [1]

One of the most noteworthy of recent developments in American life is the zeal with which machinery is designed and built ostensibly to serve various public interests and undertakings, but in reality to control them. Perhaps in no other way is the decline of faith in liberty so clearly marked. An academic wit once defined good administration as the doing extremely well of that which should not be done at all. If this clever phrase is to be applied to public administration it would have to be altered so as to read, the doing ill of that which should not be done at all; for public administration, administration by collective authority, is almost uniformly inefficient and for an obvious reason. In such case artificial choice takes the place of natural selection in the designation of agents, and since nature is wiser than man, particularly political man, efficiency at once declines. In the United States we are, in flat defiance of all our proclaimed principles and ideals, building a series of bureaucracies that will put to shame the best efforts of the government of the Tsar of all the Russias

[1] Annual report of the President of Columbia University. 1921. p. 20-3.

when in the heyday of its glory. We are surrounded by agents, special agents, inspectors and spies, and the people are called upon to support through their taxes in harmful and un-American activities whole armies of individuals who should be engaged in productive industry. When anything appears to go wrong, or when any desirable movement seems to lag, a cry goes up for the creation of some new board or commission, and for an appropriation of public funds to maintain it in reasonable comfort. An infinite number of blank forms must be filled and an infinite number of records must be kept, classified and audited at steadily mounting cost.

For a long time the excellent limitations of the American form of Federal Government held these movements in check, so far as the National Government itself was concerned. When, however, the ingenious discovery was made that the National Government might aid the states to do what lay within their province but was denied to the National Government itself, the door was opened to a host of schemes. These have followed each other in rapid succession, all urged with a certain amount of plausibility and with an appeal to kindly sentiment, usually supported by vigorous propaganda and zealous paid agents.

So far as education is concerned, there has been over-organization for a long time past. Too many persons are engaged in supervising, in inspecting and in recording the work of other persons. There is too much machinery, and in consequence a steady temptation to lay more stress upon the form of education than upon its content. Statistics displace scholarship. There are, in addition, too many laws and too precise laws, and not enough opportunity for those mistakes and failures, due to individual initiative and experiment, which are the foundation for great and lasting success.

It is now proposed to bureaucratize and to bring into uniformity the educational system of the whole United States, while making the most solemn assurance that nothing of the kind is intended. The glory and the successes of education in the United States are due to its freedom, to its unevennesses, to its reflection of the needs and ambitions and capacities of local communities, and to its being kept in close and constant touch with the people themselves. There is not money enough in the United States, even if every dollar of it were expended on education, to produce by federal authority or through what is naively called

cooperation between the Federal Government and the several states, educational results that would be at all comparable with those that have already been reached under the free and natural system that has grown up among us. If tax-supported education be first encouraged and inspected, and then little by little completely controlled, by central authority, European experience shows precisely what will happen. In so far as the schools of France are controlled from the Ministry of Education in Paris, they tend to harden into uniform machines, and it is only when freedom is given to different types of school or to different localities, that any real progress is made. Anything worse than the system which has prevailed in Prussia would be difficult to imagine. It is universally acknowledged that the unhappy decline in German university freedom and effectiveness, and the equally unhappy subjection of the educated classes to the dictates of the political and military ruling groups, were the direct result of the highly centralized and efficient control from Berlin of the nation's schools and universities. For Americans now to accept oversight and direction of their tax-supported schools and colleges from Washington would mean that they had failed to learn one of the plainest and most weighty lessons of the war. It is true that education is a national problem and a national responsibility; it is also true that it has been characteristic of the American people to solve their most difficult national problems and to bear their heaviest national responsibilities through their own action in the field of liberty rather than through the agency of organized government. Once more to tap the federal treasury under the guise of aiding the states, and once more to establish an army of bureaucrats in Washington and another army of inspectors roaming at large throughout the land, will not only fail to accomplish any permanent improvement in the education of our people, but it will assist in effecting so great a revolution in our American form of government as one day to endanger its perpetuity. Illiteracy will not be sensibly diminished, if at all, by federal appropriations, nor will the physical health of the people be thereby improved. The major portion of any appropriation that may be made will certainly be swallowed up in meeting the cost of doing ill that which should not be done at all. The true path of advance in education is to be found in the direction of keeping the people's schools closely in touch with the people themselves. Bureaucrats and experts will speedily take the life

out of even the best schools and reduce them to dried and mounted specimens of pedagogic fatuity. Unless the school is both the work and the pride of the community which it serves, it is nothing. A school system that grows naturally in response to the needs and ambitions of a hundred thousand different localities, will be a better school system than any which can be imposed upon those localities by the aid of grants of public money from the federal treasury, accompanied by federal regulations, federal inspections, federal reports and federal uniformities.

THE BILL IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL [1]

Turning then to the Smith-Towner Bill we read a document which, however laudable in the purposes which it seeks to encompass, confers upon the Federal Government a power deliberately withheld by the framers of the "growth of Americanism," we find the complete charter of an institution most foreign both to the Constitution and to American ideals, a federal censorship over the public schools of the states. The bill provides for the creation of a federal Secretary of Education, not a lay-figure, but a political appointee with powers as unique as they are dangerous. To this officer it is proposed to entrust, and at a time when the general unrest fostered by abnormal economic conditions threatens national financial disaster, the annual distribution of $100,000,000 among such states as are willing to barter their educational independence. Waving for the moment the constitutional warrant for the application of federal funds to local needs of this character, let us ask, first, if this is a time for financial experiments of this magnitude, and next, if it be wise to entrust a political appointee, however well-meaning, with the exclusive supervision of this great appropriation, together with such other sums as by the application of political motives may be granted by, or extorted from, Congress.

Again we scan the Constitution to discover in its letter or its spirit, some justification for the creation of a Federal Secretary of Education. Enriched as that venerable document now is with numerous amendments, we nowhere come upon a clause or section or amendment authorizing this royal distributor of

[1] By Rev. Paul L. Blakely. The Case Against the Smith-Towner Bill. p. 5-14.

patronage to spineless mendicant states. And since this power has not been conferred upon Congress by the Constitution, we must conclude that it does not exist.

Endeavoring to reconcile the provisions of the Smith-Towner Bill with his knowledge of the Constitution, the seeker after truth puts the question: "How does the state of New Jersey, for instance, arrange to 'cooperate' with the Federal Secretary of Education?" He will find the answer in Section 14 of the bill. The chief educational authority of the state is first directed to report in writing to the federal secretary. This report must show, to the satisfaction of the secretary, that the state of New Jersey "is prepared to carry out the provisions of this act." The question then arises, "What are the provisions of this act?" These are specified in Sections 8 to 12, both inclusive. They enumerate the instruction of illiterates ten years of age and over, in "the common school branches and the duties of citizenship;" the Americanization of immigrants, a consummation to be reached by teaching them "to speak and read the English language and to understand and appreciate the spirit and purpose of the American Government, and the duties of citizenship in a free country;" the improvement of educational opportunities by the partial payment of teachers' salaries, better instruction and longer school terms, especially in rural districts, and the extension and adaptation of public libraries for educational purposes; the preparation of teachers for public school service and the improvement of teachers in service by the establishment of scholarships, and otherwise.

In his report, the chief educational authority must submit to the Secretary of Education a complete account of all that the state of New Jersey is doing and is prepared to do, to further these purposes. He must establish, to take a dangerous instance, that the state of New Jersey is properly teaching the "Duties of Citizenship" and "the spirit and purposes of the American Government," and submit himself in this, as in every other detail specified by the bill or adducible from it, to the sole judgment of the secretary. *If the Secretary refuses his approval, the state of New Jersey must revise its courses of study for the children in the schools and for the teachers in the normal colleges, to the degree prescribed by this political appointee, or, if so ordered, not merely revise them, but reform them altogether.* If this power, plainly conferred by the Smith-Towner Bill upon the

proposed Secretary of Education, does not make that official an educational dictator, the meaning of the phrase has changed since the current dictionaries were electrotyped.

Supposing the educational program of the state of New Jersey to have merited the august approval of the political appointee at Washington, the state, to insure a continuance of that favor, must continue to subject itself to the federal educational autocrat. The secretary is not only permitted but *directed* to take such means as may be necessary "to insure that all funds apportioned to said state shall be used for the purposes" for which they were appropriated. Granted the principle of the Smith-Towner Bill, this provision is altogether necessary. There is no escape from the conclusion that whatever the Federal Government subsidizes the Federal Government controls, whether it be the waterway leading to the Gatun Dam or the schools of the respective states. Obviously, then, any studies or courses of study which the state of New Jersey may wish to introduce must be approved as in accordance with the purposes of the act, by the Secretary of Education. Similarly, should the state wish to discontinue or to revise certain methods in the training of its teachers, or to adopt an entirely new program, such action cannot be taken without permission of the secretary. Force is imparted to his orders by his control of the $100,000,000 federal appropriation. Should he judge that the "apportionment or apportionments are not being used in accordance with the provisions of the act," he is directed to withhold them, and he will also close the sluice in the golden stream, should the state of New Jersey fail to render an account of its educational work later than September 1, in any year.

As it cannot be supposed that the Secretary of Education will be advised by a kind of clairvoyance concerning the work of the schools in any "cooperating" state, the conclusion seems legitimate that the secretary will obtain this information through the examiners, investigators, and the assorted crowd of Peeping Toms and Paul Prys who, armed with federal credentials, will descend upon the schools of the respective states. Of course, it should be remembered, as the National Education Association is always assuring us, the federal secretary will exercise no control whatever over these schools. *He will merely review their courses of study, direct the training of their teachers, call them to account when they fall below the dizzy altitude*

of the federal standards, and cut them off from all federal apportionment, when "in his judgment" this punishment seems advisable, or for political reasons, imperative.

What part of the state's right over schools conducted by and under its jurisdiction can be maintained under these arbitrary conditions? In what respect does this political appointee, the proposed Federal Secretary of Education, ruling upon state educational programs with a finality to be over-turned only by his removal, differ from an educational autocrat? Nor let it be said that no state is compelled to "cooperate" with this dispenser of a federal educational slush-fund. If it does not "cooperate" it is penalized. For what it cannot in honor accept, it is forced to pay. Yet that the complete liberty of the several states is secured by Section 14 of this bill is a claim that is continually advanced by its promoters, especially by the National Education Association.

And provided further, That all the educational facilities encouraged by the provisions of this act and accepted by a state shall be organized, supervised and administered exclusively by the legally constituted state and local educational authorities of said state, and the Secretary of Education shall exercise no authority in relation thereto, *except as herein provided* to insure that all funds apportioned to said state shall be used *for the purposes for which they are appropriated and in accordance with the provisions of this act* accepted by said state.

Any force which these provisions might possess is negatived both by the express exceptions, and by other sections of the bill. Thus "state and local educational authorities" clothed, apparently, with plenary powers over their schools, are in reality subject to the orders of the federal secretary. They may do what they wish, provided, always, that their wishes are in accord with the master-mind at Washington. It has already been pointed out that as a first preliminary, the state's program must be submitted to the judgment of the secretary. It cannot be contended that the secretary is *obliged* to approve any and all programs which may be submitted. The provisions of the act are *discretionary* in this respect, not *mandatory*. If the secretary can approve he can reject, and he can also revise. The claim, theretofore, that under the Smith-Towner Bill exclusive authority over the schools is left to the states cannot be maintained. The process prescribed by the bill opens with an act

on the part of the state which is equivalent to an abdication of this authority.

Further, the bill reserves to the federal secretary authority to decide at all times whether or not the programs offered by a "cooperating" state are in keeping with the provisions of the act, gives him complete power to assign or withhold the apportionment of any state, and the right to discontinue all payments should a state refuse or fail in any year to file a report of its educational work.

Here it is of the highest importance to point out the precise "provisions of this act" upon which the federal secretary is empowered to rule with finality. They are:

1. "Common school branches and the duties of citizenship, and when advisable" vocational education. (Section 8.)
2. Courses in "Americanization" including instruction in civics and government. (Section 9.)
3. Plans for the payment of teachers' salaries, for "better instruction," for the extension of school terms, for extending and adapting public libraries for school purposes, for *"providing equally good educational opportunities for the children in the several states."* (Section 10.)

To equalize educational opportunities in the several states, the federal secretary must necessarily control these "opportunities." This absolute control is given him by the Smith Bill.

4. Federal power to exact a minimum school-year, a compulsory education law, and a basic language law, applying to all institutions, private and public. (Section 10.)
5. Power to exact instruction in "physical education," the appointment of "school nurses, dental clinics," and plans "otherwise promoting physical and mental welfare." (Section 11.)
6. Power to supervise and, if necessary, dictate plans for "the preparation of teachers for public school service," "to provide and extend facilities for the improvement of teachers already in service," and to enlist teachers "by the establishment of scholarships *and otherwise.*" (Section 12.)

Armed with this power of control, the secretary is an absolute educational dictator, for the above requirements practically cover the entire field of school economy, from courses of study for the children to courses of study for teachers, actual and prospective. On all of them the states must submit their plans to the secretary for approval. On all of them, the secretary is empowered to rule with finality. In other words, under the Smith-Towner Bill, the secretary may dictate the entire educational policy of any state.

Is this "exclusive control by the state" as we are assured by the friends of the bill? Not by deduction, but from the explicit provisions of the bill the "cooperating" state may organize and administer its schools "exclusively," *only after the state has submitted its educational policy to the federal secretary, and has secured his approval.* Should a difference of opinion arise, federal must take precedence of state authority. Should the state decline to yield, the federal secretary will refuse his approbation, and on this approbation the federal appropriation depends. Even after approbation, the state must file an annual report with the secretary, who is empowered to cut the state off from any and all appropriations should the report be deemed unsatisfactory. In other words, the state may conduct its schools as it wishes, provided that it always wishes to conduct them according to orders issued by a political appointee, the federal Secretary of Education. This is not exclusive state control. It is absolute federal control, a philosophy of Caesarism against which the framers of the Constitution provided by denying the Federal Government control of education within the states.

BILL TO EUROPEANIZE OUR PUBLIC SCHOOLS [1]

If the day should ever arrive (which God forbid) when the people of the different parts of our country should allow their local affairs to be administered from Washington—on that day the progressive political career of the American people will have come to an end, and the hopes that have been built upon it for the future happiness and prosperity of mankind will be wrecked forever.—(John Fiske, in A Critical Period of American History).

Without debate, but not without a preliminary propaganda that might well make any alien agent envious of its efficacy, the National Education Association in national convention assembled has again indorsed the Towner-Sterling Bill. A big fund is being raised by the proponents of this measure to pay the cost of the lobby that is trying to jam it through the Congress during a campaign year, while the jamming process is comparatively simple, and down the throats of the American people who will be

[1] Boston Transcript. July 7, 1922.

taxed to pay the cost of this elaborate scheme with a hyphenated name.

What is the Towner-Sterling Bill? It is a bill to Europeanize the educational system of the United States, to scrap the free school system of the several states and substitute in its place a federal system of education, subsidized from Washington, regulated from Washington, and all in imitation of the imperialistic methods of the Old World. The main provisions of the bill are two: The first provides for the creation by Congress of a Federal department of education to be headed by a secretary who shall be nominated by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall be a member of the President's Cabinet. The second provides federal aid in education in the form of a federal subsidy to be taken out of the federal treasury and doled out among the states to be used in education as Congress may from time to time decree. These two main provisions are enough to condemn the measure in the eyes of true Americans who take the trouble to think the thing through, and in their hearts cherish the hope of making a contribution in their day and generation toward the conservation and enhancement of that "American character" at home and abroad which it was the dream of Washington to develop and the destiny of Lincoln to save and the glory of Roosevelt to incarnate in his life and work.

Any bill providing for the creation of an additional executive department at Washington and an additional member of the Cabinet is to that extent a bad bill and ought to be opposed by every taxpayer in the land. Experience has demonstrated that the number of executive departments and the size of the Cabinet should be reduced, not increased, and in the light of that experience a plan for the reorganization of the executive branch of the government has been prepared and is now before the President, who will presently submit it to Congress as a basis for remedial legislation. Any bill that provides for further trespassing by the Federal Government upon the premises placed by the Constitution in the control of the several states is also bad and ought to be opposed by every taxpayer in the land. It is true that federal control will hasten standardization of education, but what true American, believing in education and religious freedom, wishes to see a system of standardized education or standardized religion established in this country and controlled in Washington?

Our own Congressman John Jacob Rogers voices, we believe, the true sentiments of the plain people of Massachusetts when he declare his belief that "Massachusetts or Califonia is a better judge of what her people should learn and use and in what schools they should learn it than any bureau or department chief can be." The late Franklin K. Lane, the able Secretary of the Interior of the last administration, put the argument against the Towner-Sterling Bill in a single sentence when he said: "Federal control of schools would be a curse, because the inevitable effect of federal control is to standarize." President Goodnow, of Johns Hopkins University, sees in this elaborate scheme with a hyphenated name "a most dangerous usurpation of power in Washington that will undermine the rights of the people." President Butler, of Columbia University, puts the case in language so plain that parents and pupils alike can understand the menace of this measure to our happiness as a people at home and our prestige as a nation abroad, when he warns the country that "once more to tap the federal treasury under the guise of aiding the state, and once more to establish an army of bureaucrats in Washington, and another army of inspectors roaming at large through the land, will not only fail to accomplish any permanent improvement in the education of our people but will assist in effecting so great a revolution in our form of government as to endanger one day its perpetuity." President Hadley, of Yale University, was in Berlin in the winter of 1907-8 and saw a great deal of the inside working of what was then the Imperial German Government; he noted that the degradation of German thought was largely due to the fact that through the establishment, first, of Berlin University and, second, of other centralized Prussian authorities, "the politicians had become able to throttle free thought." He regards the Towner-Sterling Bill as "a long step in the Prussianizing of American education," and so will every other American when he examines the provisions of the bill in the light of "the plainest and most weighty lessons of the war."

But the lobby back of the Towner-Sterling Bill would have the public believe that it does not provide for federal control of public education but that the Federal Government will be willing to scatter millions of dollars from its treasury broadcast through the several states and ask no questions as to the expenditure. If this were true, it would be taxation without representation—a tyranny more intolerable than the yoke that would be put upon

the youth of America for the rest of the time by the Europeanizing of our public schools. Of course, it is not true; it is grotesquely untrue, for the reason that the Federal Government never has been and never will be willing to subsidize an enterprise without retaining the right to regulate the expenditure of the subsidy, and federal regulation is only another name for federal control.

It would be bad enough to scrap our American system of free schools in the several states and set up in its place a Federal Department of Education, whose control would immediately become a football of partisan politics, but the vision of the National Education Association and the lobby that is backing the Towner-Sterling Bill is a "a word vision." Already steps have been taken looking to the "internationalizing" of the association. If that is accomplished and this organization gains control of a Federal Department of Education, we shall soon see federal control of our public-school system give way to international meddling, with a superdepartment of education set up at Geneva as an adjunct of the supergovernment provided for in the covenant of the League of Nations. Every teacher in the land drawing a subsidy under this elaborate scheme with a hyphenated name could then be mobilized in support of a drive to force the United States into full membership in "the evil thing with a holy name," as the late Senator Knox rightly called the League of Nations.

APPENDIX

TOWNER-STERLING BILL

H. R. 7—S. 1252

67TH CONGRESS

A BILL

To create a Department of Education, to authorize appropriations for the conduct of said department, to authorize the appropriation of money to encourage the States in the promotion and support of education, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby created an executive department in the Government to be called the Department of Education, with a Secretary of Education, who shall be the head thereof, to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall receive a salary of $12,000 per annum, and whose tenure of office shall be the same as that of the heads of other executive departments; and section 158 of the Revised Statutes is hereby amended to include such department, and the provisions of title 4 of the Revised Statutes, including all amendments thereto, are hereby made applicable to said department. The Secretary of Education shall cause a seal of office to be made for such department of such device as the President shall approve, and judicial notice shall be taken of said seal.

Sec. 2. That there shall be in said department an Assistant Secretary of Education, to be appointed by the President, who shall receive a salary to be determined by Congress. He shall perform such duties as may be prescribed by the Secretary or required by law. There shall also be one chief and a disbursing clerk and such chiefs of bureaus and clerical assistants as may from time to time be authorized by Congress.

Sec. 3. That there is hereby transferred to the Department of Education the Bureau of Education, and such offices, bureaus, divisions, boards, or branches of the Government, connected with

or attached to any of the executive departments or organized independently of any department, as Congress may determine should be administered by the Department of Education, and all such offices, bureaus, divisions, boards, or branches of the Government so transferred by act of Congress shall thereafter be administered by the Department of Education, as hereinafter provided.

All officers, clerks, and employees employed in or by any office, bureau, division, board, or branch of the Government, transferred in accordance with the provisions of this Act to the Department of Education, shall each and all be transferred to said Department of Education at their existing grades and salaries, except where otherwise provided in this Act; and the office records and papers on file pertaining exclusively to the business of any such office, bureau, division, board, or branch of the Government so transferred, together with the furniture and equipment thereof, shall be transferred to said department.

Sec. 4. That the Secretary of Education shall have charge, in the buildings or premises occupied by or assigned to the Department of Education, of the library, furniture, fixtures, records, and other property used therein or pertaining thereto, and may expend for rental of appropriate quarters for the accommodation of the Department of Education within the District of Columbia, and for the library, furniture, equipment, and all other incidental expenses, such sums as Congress may provide from time to time.

All power and authority conferred by law upon the head of any executive department, or upon any administrative board, over any officer, office, bureau, division, board, or branch of the Government, transferred in accordance with the provisions of this Act to the Department of Education, shall, after such transfer, be vested in the Secretary of Education, and all business arising therefrom or pertaining thereto, and all duties performed in connection therewith shall thereafter be administered by the Department of Education.

All laws prescribing the work and defining the duties and powers of the several offices, bureaus, divisions, boards, or branches of the Government, transferred in accordance with the provisions of this Act to the Department of Education, shall, in so far as the same are not in conflict with the provisions of this Act, remain in full force and effect and be administered by the Secretary of Education, to whom is hereby granted authority to reorganize the work of any and all of the said offices, bureaus,

boards, or branches of the Government so transferred in such way as will in his judgment best accomplish the purposes of this Act.

Sec. 5. That the Department of Education shall conduct studies and investigations in the field of education and report thereon. Research shall be undertaken in (*a*) illiteracy; (*b*) immigrant education; (*c*) public school education, and especially rural education; (*d*) physical education, including health education, recreation, and sanitation; (*e*) preparation and supply of competent teachers for the public schools; (*f*) higher education; and in such other fields as, in the judgment of the Secretary of Education, may require attention and study.

In order to carry out the provisions of this section the Secretary of Education is authorized, in the same manner as provided for appointments in other departments, to make appointments, or recommendations of appointments, of educational attachés to foreign embassies, and of such investigators and representatives as may be needed, subject to the appropriations that have been made or may hereafter be made to any office, bureau, division, board, or branch of the Government transferred in accordance with the provisions of this Act to the Department of Education; and where appropriations have not been made therefor the appropriation provided in section 6 of this Act shall be made available.

Sec. 6. That for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and annually thereafter, the sum of $500,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Department of Education, for the purpose of paying salaries and conducting studies and investigations, and paying all incidental and traveling expenses and rent where necessary, and for the purpose of enabling the Department of Education to carry out the provisions of this Act. And all appropriations which have been made and which may hereafter be made to any office, bureau, division, board, or branch of the Government, transferred in accordance with the provisions of this Act to the Department of Education, are hereby continued in full force and effect, and shall be administered by the Secretary of Education in such manner as is prescribed by law.

Sec. 7. In order to encourage the States to remove illiteracy $7,500,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is authorized

to be appropriated annually for the instruction of illiterates fourteen years of age and over. Said sum shall be apportioned to the States which qualify under the provisions of this Act, in the proportions which their respective illiterate populations fourteen years of age and over, not including foreign-born illiterates, bear to such total illiterate population of the United States, not including outlying possessions, according to the last preceding census of the United States. All funds apportioned to a State for the removal of illiteracy shall be distributed and administered in accordance with the laws of said State in like manner as the funds provided by State and local authorities for the same purpose, and the State and local education authorities of said State shall determine the courses of study, plans, and methods for carrying out the purposes of this section within said State in accordance with the laws thereof.

Sec. 8. That in order to encourage the States in the Americanization of immigrants $7,500,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is authorized to be appropriated annually to teach immigrants fourteen years of age and over to speak and read the English language and to understand and appreciate the Government of the United States and the duties of citizenship. The said sum shall be apportioned to the States which qualify under the provisions of this Act in the proportions which their respective foreign-born populations bear to the total foreign-born population of the United States, not including outlying possessions according to the last preceding census of the United States. All funds apportioned to a State for the Americanization of immigrants shall be distributed and administered in accordance with the laws of said State in like manner as the funds provided by State and local authorities for the same purpose, and the State and local educational authorities of said State shall determine the courses of study, plans, and methods for carrying out the purposes of this section within said State in accordance with the laws thereof.

Sec. 9. That in order to encourage the States to equalize educational opportunities $50,000,000 or so much thereof as may be necessary is authorized to be appropriated annually to be used in public elementary and secondary schools for the partial payment of teachers' salaries, for providing better instruction and extended school terms especially in rural schools and schools in sparsely settled localities, for the extension and adaptation of public libraries for educational purposes, and otherwise providing

equally good educational apportunities for the children of the several States. The said sum shall be apportioned to the States which qualify under the provisions of this Act one-half in the proportions which the number of children between the ages of six and twenty-one of the respective States bears to the total number of such children in the United States, and one-half in the proportions which the number of public-school teachers employed in teaching positions in the respective States bears to the total number of public-school teachers so employed in the United States, not including outlying possessions, said apportionment to be based upon statistics collected annually by the Department of Education. All funds apportioned to a State to equalize educational opportunities shall be distributed and administered in accordance with the laws of said State in like manner as the funds provided by States and local authorities for the same purpose, and the State and local educational authorities of said State shall determine the courses of study, plans and methods for carrying out the purposes of this section within said State in accordance with the laws thereof: *Provided, however,* That the apportionments authorized by this section shall be made only to such States as by law provide: (*a*) A legal school term of at least twenty-four weeks in each year for the benefit of all children of school age in such State; (*b*) A compulsory school attendance law requiring all children between the ages of seven and fourteen years to attend some school for at least twenty-four weeks in each year; (*c*) That the English language shall be the basic language of instruction in the common school branches in all schools, public and private: *Provided,* That apportionment may be made under the provisions of this section to a State prevented by its constitution from full compliance with the foregoing conditions if said conditions are approximated as nearly as constitutional limitations will permit.

Sec. 10. That in order to encourage the States in the promotion of physical education, $20,000,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is authorized to be appropriated annually for physical education and instruction in the principles of health and sanitation. Said sum shall be apportioned to the States which qualify under the provisions of this Act in the proportions which their respective populations bear to the total population of the United States, not including outlying possessions, according to the last preceding census of the United States. All funds apportioned

and administered in accordance with the laws of said State in like manner as the funds provided by State and local authorities for the same purpose, and the State and local educational authorities of said State shall determine the courses of study, plans, and methods for carrying out the purposes of this section within said State in accordance with the laws thereof.

Sec. 11. That in order to encourage the States in the preparation of teachers for public-school service, $15,000,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is authorized to be appropriated annually to provide and extend facilities for the improvement of teachers in service and for the more adequate preparation of prospective teachers, and to provide an increased number of trained and competent teachers by encouraging through the establishment of scholarships and otherwise a greater number of talented young persons to make adequate preparation for public-school service. The said sum shall be apportioned to the States which qualify under the provisions of this Act in the proportions which the number of public-school teachers employed in teaching positions in the respective States bear to the total number of public-school teachers so employed in the United States, not including outlying possessions, said apportionments to be based on statistics collected annually by the Department of Education. All funds apportioned to a State for the preparation of teachers for public-school service shall be distributed and administered in accordance with the laws of said State in like manner as the funds provided by State and local authorities for the same purpose, and the State and local educational authorities of said State shall determine the courses of study, plans, and methods for carrying out the purposes of this section within said State in accordance with the laws thereof.

Sec.12. That in order to receive apportionment from one or more of the appropriations authorized in sections 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11 of this Act a State shall by legislative enactment accept the provisions of this Act and provide for the distribution and administration of such funds as shall be apportioned to said State, and shall designate the State's chief educational authority, whether a State superintendent of public instruction, a commissioner of education, a State board of education, or other legally constituted chief educational authority, to represent said State in the administration of this Act, and such authority so designated shall be recognized by the Secretary of Education: *Provided*

That in any State in which the legislature does not meet within one year after the passage of this Act, the Governor of said State, in so far as he may have authority so to do, may take such action, temporarily, as is herein provided to be taken by legislative enactment in order to secure the benefits of this Act, and such action by the Governor shall be recognized by the Secretary of Education for the purposes of this Act until the legislature of said State shall have met in due course and been in session sixty days.

In any State accepting the provisions of this Act the State Treasurer shall be designated and appointed as custodian of all funds received by said State as apportionments under the provisions of this Act, to receive and provide for the proper custody and disbursement of the same, such disbursements to be made in accordance with the legal provisions of said State.

A State may accept the provisions of any one or more of the respective apportionments authorized in sections 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11 of this Act, and may defer the acceptance of any one or more of said apportionments: *Provided, however,* That no money shall be apportioned to any State from any of the funds authorized to be appropriated by sections 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11 of this Act, unless a sum at least equally as large shall be provided by said State, or by local authorities, or by both, for the same purpose: *And provided further,* That the sum or sums provided by the State and local authorities for the equalization of educational opportunities, for the promotion of physical education, and for the preparation of teachers shall not be less for any year than the amount provided for the same purpose for the fiscal year next preceding the acceptance of the provisions of this Act by said State: *And provided further,* That no money apportioned to a State under any of the provisions of this Act shall be used by any State or local authority, directly or indirectly, for the purchase, rental, erection, preservation, or repair of any building or equipment, or for the purchase or rental of land, or for the payment of debts or the interest thereon.

SEC. 13. That when a State shall have accepted the provisions of this Act and shall have provided for the distribution and administration of such funds as shall be apportioned to said State, and when the State's chief educational authority designated to present said State shall so report in writing to the Secretary of Education, and said report shall be approved

by the Governor of said State, showing that said State has complied with the provisions of this Act with respect to any one or more of the apportionments authorized in sections 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11 of this Act, and when annually thereafter a like report shall be filed with the Secretary of Education, approved by the Governor of said State, the Secretary of Education shall apportion to said State for the ensuing fiscal year such funds as said State may be entitled to receive under the provisions of this Act, and shall certify such apportionment or apportionments to the Secretary of the Treasury: *Provided,* That all the educational facilities encouraged by the provisions of this Act and accepted by a State shall be organized, supervised, and administered exclusively by the legally constituted State and local educational authorities of said State, and the Secretary of Education shall exercise no authority in relation thereto; and this Act shall not be construed to imply Federal control of education within the States, nor to impair the freedom of the States in the conduct and management of their respective school systems.

SEC. 14. That the Secretary of Education is authorized to prescribe plans for keeping accounts of the expenditures of such funds as may be apportioned to the States under the provisions of this Act and to audit such accounts. If the Secretary of Education shall determine that the apportionment or apportionments made to a State for the current fiscal year are not being expended in accordance with the provisions of this Act, he shall give notice in writing to the chief educational authority designated to represent said State, and to the Governor of said State, in duplicate, stating specifically wherein said State fails to comply with the provisions of this Act. If after being so notified a State fails to comply with the provisions of this Act, the Secretary of Education shall report thereon to Congress not latter than in his next annual report

If any portion of the money received by the Treasurer of a State, under the provisions of this Act, for any of the purposes herein named shall, by action or contingency, be diminished or lost, the same shall be replaced by said State, and until so replaced no subsequent apportionment for such purpose shall be made to said State. If any part of the funds apportioned annually to any State for any of the purposes named in sections 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11 of this Act has not been expended for such purpose, a sum equal to such unexpended part shall be deducted

from the next succeeding annual apportionment made to said State for such purpose.

Sec. 15. That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay quarterly to the Treasurer of each State such apportionment or apportionments as the Secretary of Education shall certify that said State is entitled to receive under the provisions of this Act.

Sec. 16. That the chief educational authority designated to represent a State receiving any of the apportionments made under the provisions of this Act shall, not later than September 1 of each year, make a report to the Secretary of Education showing the work done in said State in carrying out the provisions of this Act during the next preceding fiscal year, and the receipts and expenditures of money apportioned to said State under the provisions of this Act. If the chief educational authority designated to represent a State shall fail to report as herein provided, the Secretary of Education may discontinue all apportionments to said State until such report shall have been made.

Sec. 17. That there is hereby created a National Council on Education to consult and advise with the Secretary of Education on subjects relating to the promotion and development of education in the United States. The Secretary of Education shall be chairman of said council, which shall be constituted as follows: (*a*) The chief educational authority of each State designated to represent said State in the administration of this Act; (*b*) not to exceed twenty-five educators representing the different interests in education, to be appointed annually by the Secretary of Education; (*c*) not to exceed twenty-five persons, not educators, interested in the results of education from the standpoint of the public, to be appointed annually by the Secretary of Education. Said council shall meet for conference once each year at the call of the Secretary of Education. The members shall serve without pay, but their actual expenses incurred in attending the conferences called by the Secretary of Education shall be paid by the Department of Education.

Sec. 18. That the Secretary of Education shall annually at the close of each fiscal year make a report in writing to Congress giving an account of all moneys received and disbursed by the Department of Education and describing the work done by the department. He shall also, not later than December 1 of

each year, make a report to Congress on the administration of sections 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, and 17 of this Act, and shall include in said report a summary of the reports made to him by the several States showing the administration of this Act therein, and shall at the same time make such recommendations to Congress as will, in his judgment, improve public education in the United States. He shall also from time to time make such special investigations and reports as may be required of him by the President or by Congress.

SEC. 19. That this Act shall take effect upon its passage, and all acts or parts of Acts in conflict with this Act are hereby repealed.

Debate Material, Study Outlines, Bibliographies

for ready use are issued in the following series

SEND FOR CATALOG

The Handbook Series

19 titles. Each contains reprints of selected articles on one of the questions of the day, with bibliographies. Where the question is especially adapted to debate, briefs are included also. Prices range from $1.25 to $2.40 a volume.

Debaters' Handbook Series

Similar to the Handbook Series. 26 titles, each containing briefs, bibliographies and reprints of leading articles on both sides. $1.25-$2.40 each.

Abridged Debaters' Handbook Series

7 titles. Similar to the above series in scope but limited in size. Pamphlets. 25c-75c each.

University Debaters' Annuals

One issued each year, containing several of the leading intercollegiate debates of the year, each on a pertinent question. Briefs and bibliographies are included. $1.80-$2.25 each.

(OVER)

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 020 312 978 6

Debaters' Manual

Tells how to organize a debating society and prepare a debate, with suggestions for obtaining material. $1.50

Study Outline Series

Arranged especially for clubs. Each pamphlet contains an outline for a year's study on some subject of interest, and often references to the best material are included. Prices 15c to 50c. Special rates on quantity orders.

SEND FOR CATALOG

NOTE:—Users of these lists will find additional help in the Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature, the Cumulative Book Index, and other periodical indexes and book catalogs. Ask at your library for them.

THE H. W. WILSON COMPANY

958 University Avenue New York